A COMMENTARY ON QUINTUS OF SMYRNA *POSTHOMERICA* V

MNEMOSYNE

BIBLIOTHECA CLASSICA BATAVA

COLLEGERUNT

H. PINKSTER · H. W. PLEKET

C.J. RUIJGH · D.M. SCHENKEVELD · P. H. SCHRIJVERS

BIBLIOTHECAE FASCICULOS EDENDOS CURAVIT

C. J. RUIJGH, KLASSIEK SEMINARIUM, OUDE TURFMARKT 129, AMSTERDAM

SUPPLEMENTUM DUCENTESIMUM OCTAVUM

ALAN JAMES & KEVIN LEE

A COMMENTARY ON QUINTUS OF SMYRNA *POSTHOMERICA* V

A COMMENTARY ON QUINTUS OF SMYRNA *POSTHOMERICA* V

BY

ALAN JAMES

AND

KEVIN LEE

BRILL
LEIDEN · BOSTON · KÖLN
2000

This book is printed on acid-free paper.

Library of Congress Cataloging-in-Publication Data

James, Alan (Alan W.)
A commentary on Quintus of Smyrna Posthomerica V / by Alan James and Kevin Lee.
p. cm. — (Mnemosyne, bibliotheca classica Batava. Supplementum, ISSN 0169-8958 ; 208)
Includes bibliographical references (p.) and index.
ISBN 9004115943 (cloth : alk. paper)
1. Quintus, Smyrnaeus, 4th cent. Posthomerica. 2. Epic poetry, Greek—History and criticism. 3. Trojan War—Literature and the war. I. Lee, Kevin (Kevin H.) II. Title. III. Series.
PA4407.Q6J36 2000
883'.01—dc21 00–039798
CIP

Die Deutsche Bibliothek - CIP-Einheitsaufnahme

[Mnemosyne / Supplementum]
Mnemosyne : bibliotheca classica Batava. Supplementum. – Leiden ; Boston ; Köln : Brill
Früher Schriftenreihe
Teilw. u.d.T.: Mnemosyne / Supplements
Reihe Supplementum zu: Mnemosyne
208. James, Alan and Lee, Kevin: A commentary on Quintus of Smyrna Posthomerica V – 2000

James, Alan:
A commentary on Quintus of Smyrna Posthomerica V / by Alan James and Kevin Lee. – Leiden ; Boston ; Köln : Brill, 2000
(Mnemosyne : Supplementum ; 208)
ISBN 90–04–11594–3

ISSN 0169-8958
ISBN 90 04 11594 3

© Copyright 2000 by Koninklijke Brill NV, Leiden, The Netherlands

All rights reserved. No part of this publication may be reproduced, translated, stored in a retrieval system, or transmitted in any form or by any means, electronic, mechanical, photocopying, recording or otherwise, without prior written permission from the publisher.

Authorization to photocopy items for internal or personal use is granted by Brill provided that the appropriate fees are paid directly to The Copyright Clearance Center, 222 Rosewood Drive, Suite 910 Danvers 01923, USA. Fees are subject to change.

PRINTED IN THE NETHERLANDS

CONTENTS

Preface vii
Abbreviations ix

Introduction
A – The Poem and its Date 1
B – Book 5 and its Sources 9
C – Beliefs and Interests 11
D – Characterisation 13
E – Narrative Technique 16
F – Language and Style 21
G – Formulae 24
H – Metre 30

Commentary
1-120: The Arms of Achilles 33
121-179: Introduction to the Contest 68
180-317: The Debate between Ajax and Odysseus 80
318-332: The Judgement and its Immediate Impact 106
333-351: Prelude to the Night 109
352-394: The Night of Ajax's Madness 111
395-403: Dawn 119
404-450: Ajax's Madness—the Slaughter of the Sheep 121
451-486: Ajax's Recovery and Suicide 127
487-663: The Mourning and Funeral of Ajax 133

Bibliography 159
Indexes
Subjects 161
Ancient and Mediaeval Literature 164
Greek Words 168

PREFACE

The remarkable neglect of the *Posthomerica* by modern scholarship, to which we call attention in our introduction, has to some extent been counterbalanced by the high quality of the work devoted to it by several editors and commentators. Its text was first put into a tolerable state by Rhodomann in his edition of 1604. Our commentary testifies to the extraordinarily large proportion of his emendations that has been accepted as palmary. Considerable textual improvements were made by three nineteenth-century editions, those of Tychsen (1807), Koechly (1850) and Zimmermann (1891), though somewhat at the cost of unnecessary emendation and assumption of lacunae. Koechly's edition included valuable linguistic and metrical *prolegomena* and a substantial commentary, largely devoted to textual problems. The first text securely based on thorough recension of the manuscripts was that of Vian, and that is what we have reproduced in all our lemmata, differentiated from other Greek by bold type. His edition (1963-9) undid most of the excesses of its predecessors and incorporated an excellent, albeit brief, commentary. Finally, some textual refinements were made, mostly in the direction of conservatism, by the edition of Pompella (1979-93).

The only full-scale commentary published hitherto is that of M. Campbell on book 12 (1981). That book has usually attracted attention for the comparability of its version of the story of the wooden horse and related episodes with that of Virgil. Campbell did not neglect that aspect, but he placed the overwhelming weight of his commentary on examination of language in exhaustive detail. Our own choice of book 5 was made primarily because of the interesting question of sources for Quintus' version of the contest for the armour of Achilles and the consequent death of Ajax, in particular its relationship to the versions of Ovid and Sophocles, on which good work had been done and conflicting conclusions reached by Keydell and Vian. Our aim has been to strike a somewhat different balance from Campbell's between these and other literary aspects on the one hand and full examination of language and style on the other. The latter has certainly been kept in view throughout, and we wish to acknowledge that this side of our work has been enormously facilitated by Vian and Battegay's excellent lexicon of the *Posthomerica*, as well as by Pompella's index. Our

commentary, like Campbell's, presents a challenge to Campbell's own more recent observation (1994), in the preface to his commentary on book 3 (1-471) of Apollonius' *Argonautica*, that "no Greek poem presents us with a more sustained or more intricate manipulation" of the Homeric epics. It may be said of our commentary that it has the character of a continuous dialogue between Quintus' text and innumerable Homeric subtexts, with frequent interjections from other voices, which occasionally become dominant. The extent of its contribution to a better understanding of Quintus' work in general and to a reappraisal of his achievement is a matter for others to judge.

An acknowledgement that it is a pleasure to make is to our research assistants Adam Bartley and Michael Curran, whose scholarship and word-processing skills have made an indispensable contribution to the preparation of a difficult text. Lastly, we wish to thank the University of Sydney for periods of study leave during the six years or so of our happy collaboration. It should be understood that for everything that follows we bear joint responsibility.

Sydney, January 2000 A.W.J. and K.H.L.

ABBREVIATIONS

Ancient Literature and periodicals are referred to either according to the conventions respectively of LSJ and *L'année philologique* or more explicitly.
Books of the *Iliad* and the *Odyssey* are denoted by the traditional use of Greek letters, majuscules for the *Iliad* and minuscules for the *Odyssey*.
All references in the form of the book and line numbers alone are to the *Posthomerica*; those with line numbers alone are to book 5 of the same.

A.R.	Apollonius Rhodius, *Argonautica*
Campbell	M. Campbell, *A Commentary on Quintus Smyrnaeus, Posthomerica XII*, Leiden 1981
Chantraine *GH*	P. Chantraine, *Grammaire homérique*, Paris 1953-8
Combellack	F.M. Combellack, *The War at Troy: What Homer Didn't Tell, by Quintus of Smyrna*, Norman 1968
Cunliffe *LHD*	R.J. Cunliffe, *A Lexicon of the Homeric Dialect*, London 1924
Ebeling *LH*	H. Ebeling, *Lexicon Homericum*, Leipzig 1885
H.	Homer, Homeric
Kakridis	P.I. Kakridis, *Κόιντος Σμυρναῖος: Γενική μελέτη τῶν Μεθ' "Ομηρον καὶ τοῦ ποιητή τους*, Athens 1962
Keydell *RE*	R. Keydell, "Quintus von Smyrna", *RE* 47 (1963) 1271-96
Koechly	A.(H.) Koechly, *Quinti Smyrnaei Posthomericorum libri XIV...prolegomenis et adnotatione critica*, Leipzig 1850
Kühner-Gerth	R. Kühner & B. Gerth, *Ausführliche Grammatik der griechischen Sprache, II. Satzlehre*, 3rd ed. Hanover 1898-1904

Lehrs	F. S. Lehrs, *Quinti Posthomerica*, Paris 1840
LFE	*Lexikon des frühgriechischen Epos*, edd. B. Snell and H. Erbse, Göttingen 1955-
LIMC	*Lexicon Iconographicum Mythologiae Classicae*, Zürich 1981-
LSJ	H.G. Liddell, R. Scott and H.S. Jones, *A Greek-English Lexicon*, 9th ed., Oxford 1940
Monro *GHD*	D.B. Monro, *A Grammar of the Homeric Dialect*, 2nd ed. Oxford 1891
Pompella	G. Pompella, *Quinto Smirneo, Le Posthomeriche, libri III-VII*, Cassino 1987
Pompella *Index*	—, *Index in Quintum Smynaeum*, Hildesheim 1981
PH.	*Posthomerica*
Q.	Quintus of Smyrna
RE	*Paulys Real-Encyclopädie der classischen Altertumswissenschaft*, edd. G. Wissowa et al., Stuttgart/Munich 1893-
Rhodomann	L. Rhodomann, *Quinti Calabri Paraleipomena...XIV libris...latine reddita*, Hanover 1604
Vian I	F. Vian, *Quintus de Smyrne, La suite d' Homère, livres I-IV*, Paris 1963
Vian II	—, —, *livres V-IX*, Paris 1966
Vian III	—, —, *livres X-XIV*, Paris 1969
Vian *Comp.*	—, "Les comparaisons de Quintus de Smyrne", *RPh* 28 (1954) 30-51, 235-43
Vian *Rech.*	—, *Recherches sur les Posthomerica de Quintus de Smyrne*, Paris 1959
Vian and Battegay	F. Vian and E. Battegay, *Lexique de Quintus de Smyrne*, Paris 1984
Way	A.S. Way, *Quintus Smyrnaeus, The Fall of Troy, with an English translation*, London and New York 1913
Zimmermann	A. Zimmermann, *Quinti Smyrnaei Posthomericorum libri XIV*, Leipzig 1891

INTRODUCTION

A - THE POEM AND ITS DATE[1]

The *Posthomerica* of Quintus of Smyrna is a Greek epic poem in fourteen books with a total of nearly 8,800 lines, and so rather more than half as long as the *Iliad*. The title translates the Greek τὰ μεθ' Ὅμηρον, used in some MSS. of the work, and the natural English translation is *The Sequel to Homer*, like the French *la Suite d' Homère*, which Vian uses for his Budé edition.[2] This accurately reflects the fact that the epic tells the traditional story of the Trojan war beginning precisely at the point where the *Iliad* ends, the funeral of Hector. Its contents are as follows: the successive deaths of Penthesilea, Memnon and Achilles (books 1-3); the funeral games in honour of Achilles and the death of Telamonian Ajax (books 4 and 5); the exploits of Eurypylus for the Trojans and of Neoptolemus for the Greeks (books 6-8); the battle at the walls of Troy and the arrival of Philoctetes (book 9); the death of Paris, the Greeks' last attack, the making of the wooden horse and the subsequent episodes of Sinon and Laocoön, Cassandra's prophecies and the sack of Troy (books 10-13); the departure of the Greeks, the storm on the return voyage and the death of Locrian Ajax (book 14). Q.'s cut-off point was determined by its approximation to the beginning of the *Odyssey*. His obvious intention was to fill precisely the gap between the two Homeric epics, as had been done by most of the Trojan constituents of the Epic Cycle–the *Aethiopis*, the *Little Iliad*, the *Ilioupersis* and the *Nostoi*. The historical question of why these epics needed to be replaced will be considered later. It was undoubtedly the success with which Q. met this need that ensured the survival of his work. His is the only surviving full-scale, poetic treatment of this Trojan material in Greek, and those Renaissance MSS. which place the *PH*. between the *Iliad* and the *Odyssey*[3] no doubt continue a practice that goes back to the early transmission of the work.

The closeness of the *PH*. in language and style to its H. models is such that it presents no serious difficulty for a competent student of H., unlike most Hellenistic epic and the later epic of Nonnus and his followers. These considerations, however, have not made the *PH*. a popular or influential work in the age of print. Since its first edition, the Aldine of 1505, there have been only eleven of the complete work, three in the twentieth century.[4]

---

1 The standard treatments are those of F. Vian, *Quintus de Smyrne, la Suite d'Homère*, tome I (Paris 1963), introd. vii-xxvii, xlv-liii, to which the following is primarily indebted, and R. Keydell, *R.E.* 47 (1963), s.v. "Quintus von Smyrna", 1271-3, 1295-6.

2 F. Vian, *op. cit.*, I (1963), II (1966), III (1969).

3 *Vindobon. phil. gr.5, Cantabrig. Corporis Christi Coll. 81, Marc. gr. Z 456.*

4 (1) *Quinti Calabri derelictorum ab Homero libri XIV*, in aed. Aldi (Venetiis 1505); (2) *Quinti Calabri...Praetermissorum ab Homero libri XIV*, ed. H. Henricpetri (Basileae 1569); (3) *Quinti Calabri Paraleipomena*, ed. L. Rhodomann (Hanoviae 1604); (4) *Quinti Calabri Praetermissorum ab Homero libri XIV*, ed. J. C. de Pauw (Lugduni Batavorum 1734); (5)

The first-ever English translation was the old-fashioned poetry of Arthur Way in his Loeb edition of 1913, which has been followed only by the prose version of F. M. Combellack, published in 1968.[5] In English schools and universities the original has had the sorry reputation of serving mainly as a hunting ground for epic unseens, in the days when students were expected to read most of H. Some have dismissed the *PH.* in such intemperate terms as those used by H. Lloyd-Jones:[6] "The anaemic pastiche served up by Q. is utterly devoid of life." Our own experience has been comparable with that recorded by F. A. Paley: [7]

> I purposely made my own careful perusals (not once, but several times) of the work of Q. before I referred to the literary accounts of his general merits as a poet. And I must say I was somewhat surprised at the disparaging verdict by which he is almost put out of the category, so to say, of poets deserving any consideration at all.

Five hundred years ago the Greek émigré and scholar Constantine Lascaris wrote an introduction to the MS. of the *PH.* which he copied himself and completed on 13 June 1496 at Messina in Sicily.[8] For essentials it has not been superseded or greatly bettered, and we make no apology for quoting the following part of it in our own translation.[9]

> What country, parents or time our poet Quintus belonged to he himself does not say nor has anyone else recorded, as far as I am aware. Nothing is recorded about him in the Suda, nor have I gathered anything from living sources. But most of the commentators on H. mention him by name, and one may infer that he was a native of Smyrna from the following lines that he wrote in book 12 [306-13] of his poem, where he summons the Muses from Smyrna in the catalogue of heroes: 'Muses, in answer to my question tell me clearly each one of those who descended into the capacious horse. For you inspired me with all my song before down spread over my cheeks, when I tended famous sheep in the land of Smyrna, three times further from

Quinti Smyrnaei Posthomericorum libri XIV, ed. T. C. Tychsen (Argentorati 1807); (6) *Quinti Posthomerica*, ed. F. S. Lehrs (Parisiis 1840); (7) *Quinti Smyrnaei Posthomericorum libri XIV*, ed. A. Koechly (Lipsiae 1850); (8) *Quinti Smyrnaei Posthomericorum libri XIV*, ed. A Zimmermann (Lipsiae 1891); (9) *Quintus Smyrnaeus, The Fall of Troy*, ed. A. S. Way (London and New York 1913); (10) *Op. cit.*, ed F. Vian (Paris 1963-9); (11) *Quinto Smirneo, Le Postomeriche*, ed. G. Pompella, *libri I-II* (Naples 1979), *libri III-VII* (Cassino 1987), *libri VIII-XIV* (Cassino 1993). A few reprints have been omitted.

5 *The War at Troy, What Homer Didn't Tell, by Quintus of Smyrna*, transl. F. M. Combellack (Norman, U.S.A., 1968).

6 Review of Combellack, *CR* 19 (1969) 101.

7 *Quintus Smyrnaeus and the 'Homer' of the Tragic Poets* (2nd ed., London 1879), 4. We regret that a recent assessment of Q.'s poetic worth, that by E.G. Schmidt, "Quintus von Smyrna—der schlechteste Dichter des Altertums?", *Phasis* 1 (1999) 139-50, has not been available to us.

8 *Matritensis gr. 4686*; it is a copy of *Matritensis gr. 4566*, which Lascaris caused to be made in 1464-5. Lascaris' MSS. were transferred from Messina to the National Library at Madrid in 1712.

9 The Greek text is printed in Koechly's edition of the *PH.*, *prol.* cxi-cxii. There appears to be no published translation.

the Hermus than a shout can be heard, round the temple of Artemis in the Garden of Freedom, on a mountain neither very low nor very high.' His Roman name proves that he did not live in early times, but when the Greeks were ruled by the Romans and they even used Latin names to flatter their rulers. Κβίντος, which we resolve into a diphthong and pronounce Κόϊντος, means 'fifth' in Latin....After the neglect of earlier generations had somehow caused the loss of such a man, in our time, after the fall of our fatherland, he was discovered, preserved and published by that excellent and truly wise restorer of antiquity, Bessarion, Cardinal of Nicaea, the greatest man in our cause. He saved many other works and discovered this poem in the church of St. Nicholas of Casoli outside the city of Otranto....I myself, when in my travels I came to Milan and taught our language, taking pains to acquire many works including this poem, I copied them, shared them and taught them, as I suppose other humane and learned men will do.

Both Lascaris and Bessarion were important promoters of Greek studies in Italy. Lascaris' Greek grammar, published at Milan in 1476, was the first book printed entirely in Greek. Bessarion was made cardinal and later Latin Patriarch of Constantinople for his support of the Roman church at the Council of Florence in 1439. In 1468 he presented his large collection of Greek MSS. to the senate of Venice, and it formed the nucleus of the library of St. Mark.[10] His discovery of the *PH.* in the Basilian monastery of San Niccolò di Casoli near Otranto was made some time between 1453, the fall of Constantinople, and 1462, the date on one of its direct copies.[11] Some obvious considerations would have led him to look there. The Greek monasteries of St. Basil's rule throughout South Italy had a strong tradition of copying MSS., and they yielded many treasures. And in the vicinity of Otranto a dialect of Greek has survived that has its roots in the ancient colonies of Magna Graecia.[12] The record of this discovery had the curious result that in the early printed editions of the *PH.* the author is misnamed 'Quintus of Calabria', because in antiquity Calabria denoted the heel of Italy. Bessarion's MS. is lost, but numerous copies, direct and indirect, survive. Only one complete MS. of the *PH.* is not derived from it; it once belonged to the scholar Janus Parrhasius and is preserved at Naples.[13] With its help a common ancestor can be reconstructed, which because of its deducible format is likely to have been produced in the second half of the thirteenth century. Virtually nothing can be reconstructed of the earlier transmission of the *PH.*

In the second half of the twelfth century Eustathius' commentaries on the *Iliad* and the *Odyssey* contain six references to Q., always simply as Κόιντος.[14] The contemporary works of John Tzetzes contain twelve refer-

10 See L. Labowsky, *Bessarion's Library & the Bibliotheca Marciana* (Rome 1979).

11 *Ambrosianus D528 inf.*

12 See R. Browning, *Medieval and Modern Greek* (2nd ed., Cambridge 1983), 131-2; G. Rohlfs, *Historische Grammatik der unteritalienischen Gräzität* (Munich 1950).

13 *Neapolitanus gr. II F 10 (= Parrhasianus).*

14 Eustathius, introd. to *Iliad*, A468 (136.4), B814 (352.2), Θ501 (1608.1), λ546 (1698.48), λ592 (1702.11).

ences to him, either as Κόιντος or as Κόιντος ὁ Σμυρναῖος. Six of these are in Tzetzes' own *Posthomerica*,[15] a prosaic coverage of Q.'s subject matter in 780 faulty hexameters. Just one H. scholium, on *Iliad* 2.220 (AD Gen.), refers to Q., as Κόιντος ὁ ποιητής. These, until very recently, were the only mentions of Q. surviving from the middle ages or antiquity, which confirms the thoroughness of Lascaris' research on the matter.

The ostensibly autobiographical passage quoted by Lascaris from the *PH.* (12.306-13), which is the only case of explicit self-reference in the epic, must be understood at least partly as a reflection of two well-known passages in early epic. One is the invocation of the Muses at *Iliad* 2.484-92, which like the present passage introduces a catalogue, the so-called Catalogue of Ships. The other is the proem of Hesiod's *Theogony*, 1-34, especially 22-23, where Hesiod records his inspiration by the Muses while tending sheep at the foot of mount Helicon. Q.'s location at Smyrna, however, does not have the appearance of a purely literary element, even though Smyrna was famous for its claim to be the birthplace of H., and in Roman times one of its sights was the Homereion, a temple and stoa dedicated to H.[16] The insistent particularity of the topographic details would seem to lack point other than as a factual record. They cannot be verified, but Vian has shown that they are at least compatible with the territory of Smyrna that lies between the river Hermus and mount Sipylus. He also suggests a link between Q.'s Garden of Freedom and a local festival named the Eleutheria.[17] Recently, however, a purely symbolic interpretation has been propounded for the 'mountain neither very low nor very high (12.313),' namely that the *PH.* is written in a middle style, avoiding extremes.[18] Q.'s self-presentation as a shepherd not only belongs to the Hesiodic reference, but is intrinsically implausible at the literal level. His poetry was certainly the product of a thorough literary education, and that suggests rather different social circumstances. A plausible non-literal interpretation was first suggested by Lorenz Rhodomann in his edition of 1604 (*praefat.* 3), that Q. was a schoolmaster whose sheep were his pupils. There is in fact some evidence that the image was a conventional one in the imperial period. In a fourth-century funerary poem for a schoolmaster from Smyrna his pupils are called 'a flock of youths.'[19] Finally, the authenticity of Q.'s Smyrnaean background receives general support from the quite numerous passages of the *PH.* which show detailed knowledge of western Asia Minor.

---

15 Tzetzes, *Posthom.* 10, 13, 282, 522, 584, 597; *Prooem. in Iliadem* 482; schol. to Lycophron, *Alex.* 61, 1048; *Exeg. in Iliadem* p.772.20 (Bachmann); *Chiliad.* 2.489f.; schol. to Tzetzes, *Posthom.* 282.

16 Strabo, 14.1.37 (646).

17 The recent suggestion by W. Appel ("Grundsätzliche Bemerkungen zu den *Posthomerica* und Quintus Smyrnaeus", *Prometheus* 20 [1994], 1-13, esp. 9-12) that Q. may have competed with parts of his work at such local festivals as the Hadrianic Olympics is pure speculation.

18 N. Hopkinson, *Greek Poetry of the Imperial Period, an Anthology* (Cambridge 1994), 106, and *OCD*^{3} (1996), "Quintus Smyrnaeus", where he even queries the literal truth of Q.'s origin in Smyrna.

19 D. L. Page, *Literary Papyri, Poetry* (London and Cambridge, Mass., 1950), 138.61.

Notably absent from this solitary piece of autobiography is any indication of date, about which speculation has consequently ranged freely from the age of H. to that of Justinian. Throughout the *PH.* there is an almost total avoidance of historical traces. Two passages, however, locate it undeniably in the Roman imperial period. At 6.532-6 a simile describes executions in an amphitheatre by wild beasts, lions and boars being specified. The practice was introduced to Asia Minor under Augustus, and its discontinuation, which was certainly very late, cannot be dated definitely. One such event in the amphitheatre at Smyrna was never forgotten by many of its inhabitants, the martyrdom of its first bishop, Polycarp, in either 155-6 or 167-8. He was actually burnt, but the original intention was to use lions.[20] Q.'s one explicit reference to the Roman empire is the prophecy of Calchas concerning Aeneas at 13.336-41:

> It is decreed by the gods that he shall go from the Xanthus to the broad Tiber and found a holy city, the wonder of future generations. He shall rule over widely scattered peoples, and his descendants shall reign hereafter as far as the rising and the setting of the sun.

It has been argued that such an unqualified linking of the city of Rome with universal rule is unlikely to postdate the inauguration of Constantinople as a new seat of government in 330. That is far from certain, but it is relevant to compare repeated mentions of Constantinople as 'Rome' in the fourth-century poem referred to above. What Lascaris says about the name Quintus indicating that the poet lived under Roman rule is basically correct. It was not uncommon in the imperial period for persons in the Greek area to be known by just a Latin *praenomen*, sometimes with a place name added.[21]

A much narrower dating of Q. has been achieved on the basis of the evidence for his place in literary history. As early as 1805 Gottfried Hermann[22] demonstrated that Q.'s vocabulary and syntax indicate a date well into the imperial period, but that his metre is unaffected by the metrical reforms of Nonnus, which have been firmly dated in the mid fifth century. This consideration alone is insufficient to establish relative chronology, but since motifs and usages common to the *PH.* and the *Dionysiaca* of Nonnus prove influence one way or the other, there is a strong presumption that Q. was the earlier. Influence has also been proved between the *PH.* and Triphiodorus' short epic *The Capture of Troy*, which because of a papyrus fragment[23] is known to be not later than the mid fourth century. Stylistic links between Triphiodorus and Nonnus make it probable, though not certain, that Q. antedates them both. Accordingly the mid fourth century is a probable *terminus ante quem* for Q.

---

20 See *The Martyrdom of Polycarp* in *The Apostolic Fathers*, vol. 2, ed. Kirsopp Lake (London and New York 1913). For a similar event possibly witnessed by Q. himself see *Le Martyre de Pionios, prêtre de Smyrne*, ed. L. Robert, G.W. Bowersock, C.P. Jones (Washington D.C. 1994).

21 See A.D. Rizakis (ed.), *Roman Onomastics in the Greek East: Social and Political Aspects* (Athens 1996).

22 *De aetate scriptoris Argonauticorum* in *Orphica* (Lipsiae 1805).

23 *Pap. Oxy. 2946.*

A firm *terminus post quem* for him is established by the relationship of the *PH.* to the didactic epic of Oppian, the *Halieutica.* Twice in similes and once in a digression on fishermen killed in battle[24] Q. adapts material that is germane to Oppian's subject, fishing, but purely incidental in the *PH.*, so that the clear indebtedness is of Q. to Oppian, who could hardly have gleaned such material from isolated digressions in the *PH.* The *Halieutica* can be quite precisely dated by its dedication to Marcus Aurelius and his son Commodus as joint rulers, which narrows it down to the four years from Commodus' becoming *imperator* in 176 and the death of Marcus Aurelius in 180. A hazardous *argumentum ex silentio* for a rather later *terminus post quem* is the fact that Q. is not mentioned in a work that is remarkable for the richness of its information on the literary circles of Smyrna, Philostratus' *Lives of the Sophists,* which is dedicated to the proconsul Antonius Gordianus and was therefore presumably completed by 238.

Because the *raison d'être* of the *PH.* was replacement of the early Cyclic epics that covered a large part of the Trojan material, the question of Q.'s date must be considered in relation to the evidence for the period at which those epics disappeared. The ninth-century patriarch Photius in his *Bibliotheca* summarises the *Chrestomathia,* or *Summary of Useful Knowledge,* of a certain Proclus, from which he quotes as follows:[25]

> The poems of the Epic Cycle are preserved and studied by most people not so much for their merit as for the continuity of subject matter contained in them.

Earlier identification of this Proclus with the Neoplatonist who lived from 412 to 485 naturally led to the conclusion that the epics were still current in the fifth century. But there are strong positive indications that the Cyclic epics fell out of circulation much earlier and that consequently identification with the Neoplatonist Proclus is very unlikely. John Philoponus, who lived in the early sixth century, in his commentary on Aristotle's *Analytica Posteriora*[26] states that a certain Pisander fulfilled the same function as the Epic Cycle in providing an extensive record of events in correct order, and that the superior poetic quality of his work led to the neglect of the earlier poems, with the result that the Cyclic epics were no longer to be found. This was the *Heroicae Theogamiae* of Pisander of Laranda, who wrote under Alexander Severus (222-235), an epic in sixty books said to have been the longest poem of antiquity, covering the whole range of Greek mythology. It is therefore unlikely that the Cycle was available two centuries later, although this cannot be proved. There is, however, a strong argument that it was not available to Q. Though he covers the same ground as a large part of the Cycle, his narrative differs in many significant details from the early epics, notably the *Little Iliad* and the *Ilioupersis* as they are known to us from the summaries of their contents preserved with the scholia to the

24 *PH.* 7.569-75 ~ *Hal.* 4.640-6, *PH.* 9.172-7 ~ *Hal.* 3.567-75, *PH.* 11.62-5 ~ *Hal.* 4.637-9. See F. Vian, "Les comparaisons de Quintus de Smyrne," *RPh* 28 (1954), 50-1.

25 Photius, *Bibl.* 319A21 (5.157 Henry).

26 77B32, *Comment. in Arist. Graec.* 13.3.156-7, ed. M. Wallies.

Iliad.[27] The likelihood that these differences arise, at least in part, from his dependence on later sources is strengthened by some close correspondences between the *PH.* and the *Epitome* of Apollodorus' mythographic compilation the *Bibliotheca.*[28] He can also be shown to have made substantial use of later poetic sources, e.g. Sophocles' *Ajax*, Euripides' *Hecuba* and *Supplices*, Apollonius' *Argonautica* and Lycophron's *Alexandra.* We leave aside the vexed question of indebtedness to Virgil's *Aeneid*, Ovid's *Metamorphoses* and Seneca's *Agamemnon.* Accordingly it is likely that Q.'s motivation in undertaking his epic and also his success with it are attributable to the loss, perhaps the very recent loss, of the Cyclic epics,[29] and that his work was later than that of Pisander, i.e. not earlier than the mid third century. From this and from some of the considerations already noted the upper and lower limits for Q.'s *floruit* appear to be the mid third century and the early fourth century.

Progress beyond this conclusion has been made possible by the publication of the Bodmer papyrus no. 29 in 1984,[30] a codex dating from about 400 A.D., which was acquired by Martin Bodmer in the same lot as his Menander codex. It contains a Greek poem of about 360 hexameters with the title Ὅρασις Δωροθέου, *The Vision of Dorotheus.* It purports to be an autobiographical record of a Christian's vision set in 'the house of God,' which involves punishment for desertion of his post and subsequent restoration to a place of honour. A plausible suggestion for its background is the failure of the subject to confess his religion at a time of persecution. Its language is basically that of Greek epic with many words and phrases taken from H., but there is a substantial admixture of non-poetic words, some distinctively Christian and some vernacular, including Latin terms. There is frequent corruption of epic language, both morphological and prosodical. Altogether it is the work of someone with considerable knowledge of Greek epic, but very defective mastery of its practice.

The work's relevance to the present subject is the fact that the author calls himself the son of Quintus, at line 300 with a patronymic attached to his name, ὁ Κυντιάδης Δωρόθεος. Then at the end of the text there is the following colophon: τέλος τῆς ὁράσεως Δωροθέου Κυΐντου ποιητοῦ. In itself this is ambiguous, meaning either "the end of the vision

27 See *Homeri opera*, vol. 5, ed. T. W. Allen (Oxford 1912 & 1946), II *Cyclus*, 93. Q.'s most important divergence from the *Little Iliad* is in placing the arrivals of Eurypylus and Neoptolemus before the return of Philoctetes and the death of Paris. He departs from the *Ilioupersis* most notably in placing the episode of Laocoön before the entry of the wooden horse into Troy and the departure of Aeneas during the night of Troy's destruction.

28 Correspondences between the *PH.* and the *Bibliotheca* include omission of the purification of Achilles for killing Thersites, initiation of the embassy to Philoctetes by Calchas instead of by Helenus, and linking of the revenge of Nauplius with the punishment of Locrian Ajax.

29 This view has been most recently endorsed by W. Appel, *op. cit.* (note 17), 5.

30 *Vision de Dorothéos, Papyrus Bodmer 29*, ed. A. Hurst, O. Reverdin, J. Rudhardt (Cologny-Genève 1984). For an improved text, with translation and commentary, see A.H.M. Kessels and P.W. Van der Horst, "The vision of Dorotheus", *Vigiliae Christ.* 41 (1987) 313-59.

of the poet Dorotheus Quintus" or "the end of the vision of Dorotheus son of the poet Quintus". In the light of the patronymic in the text the latter must be the intended meaning. By a curious logic E. Livrea[31] insists that the former meaning is the only possible one, explicable as the copyist's misunderstanding of the patronymic. G. Agosti[32] even suggests that by Dorotheus' time the patronymic would have lost its proper meaning. But no one would have applied such an epic flourish to his own name without intending it to be understood correctly. In the absence of rival candidates and of any historical difficulty it is reasonable to assume that the father in question is none other than our poet. One would expect the definite article τοῦ before ποιητοῦ, as in Κόιντος ὁ ποιητής in the scholium to *Iliad* 2.220 cited above, but it could easily have been lost by haplography, as the editors suggest. Κυντιάδης is clearly a misspelling of Κυιντιάδης. Κυίντος is notably different from the later Greek spelling Κόιντος, but virtually the same as Lascaris' representation of the Latin pronunciation with Κβίντος.

If we look for traces of Q.'s influence on Dorotheus' poem beyond the general one of aspiring to Homerise a Christian subject, there are just a few. The first editors of the text noted some similarities of poetic diction as possibly attributable to direct influence. Strictly speaking these cannot prove or disprove a personal connection, but they are relevant as circumstantial evidence. They have been scrutinised by G. Agosti (*op. cit.*) and in most cases shown to be insignificant. He accepts just two as possibly significant[33] and concludes that this is insufficient to establish the *PH.* as anything more than one of a number of models, not even among the most important. However, the most striking verbal link between them is dismissed by Agosti altogether too lightly, the use at line 209 of a very rare adverb, ἐπεσσυμένως, which occurs in the MSS. of the *PH.* in no less than six places[34], all of them emended by Vian, but certainly defensible in at least two (7.499, 13.39), as Agosti himself admits. Also, the strongest case of all for deliberate and pointed reference by Dorotheus to the work of Q. seems not to have been considered by anyone. At lines 340-1 Dorotheus' statement of his poetic inspiration, ἐν στήθεσσιν ἀοιδὴν / παντοίην ἐνέηκε, was seen by the first editors as consciously reflecting Hesiod's similar statement at *Theogony* 22, αἵ νύ ποθ' Ἡσίοδον καλὴν ἐδίδαξαν ἀοιδήν. The latter is undoubtedly alluded to earlier by Dorotheus at 173-4, βαλὼν χαρίεσσαν ἀοιδὴν / ἐν στήθεσσιν ἐμοῖσιν, which is followed shortly, at 176-7, by an actual quotation and adaptation of

31 Review of "Vision de Dorothéos", *Gnomon* 58 (1986) 688.

32 In M. Fantuzzi and R. Pretagostini, *Struttura e storia dell ' esametro greco*, vol. 1, Rome 1995, Excursus 1, "Doroteo e Quinto di Smirne", n. 6

33 132 ἀτασθαλίῃσι πιθήσας/ = *PH.* 10.317, 325; ἐελδόμενος πονέεσθαι/ = *PH.* 4.263.

34 1.388, 5.92, 270, 6.537, 7.499, 13.39; see F. Vian and E. Battegay, *Lexique de Quintus de Smyrne* (Paris 1984) s.v. ἐπισσεύω.

Theogony 31-32. But the wording at 340-1 is actually closer to that of Q. at *PH.* 12.308, in the autobiographical passage considered above, ὑμεῖς γὰρ πᾶσάν μοι ἐνὶ φρεσὶ θήκατ' ἀοιδήν.

The last piece in the jigsaw, so to speak, is the first editors' persuasive identification of the Dorotheus in question with one mentioned several times in Eusebius' *Ecclesiastical History*[35], with whom Eusebius was personally acquainted. He was made priest at Antioch about 290, was learned in Greek and Hebrew and enjoyed imperial favour until the persecution of Diocletian (303-11), during which he was tortured to death. If these identifications of the father Quintus and the son Dorotheus are correct[36], we can now fix the *floruit* of Q. with near certainty as mid to late third century.

B - BOOK 5 AND ITS SOURCES

In book 5 of the *PH.* two episodes are narrated at almost equal length, first the contest between Ajax and Odysseus over the armour of Achilles, and second the death and funeral of Ajax. The former is a continuation of the funeral games in honour of Achilles, which occupies book 4, and the latter brings to a conclusion the series of events that constitutes the first major section of the *PH.* These events are focused on the successive deaths of two outstanding heroes on either side, of Penthesilea and Memnon on the Trojan side and of Achilles and Ajax son of Telamon on the Greek, clearly presented as counterbalancing pairs. Further development of the war depends upon the arrival of new champions, Eurypylus for the Trojans and Achilles' son Neoptolemus for the Greeks.

Detailed analysis of the episodes of book 5 as well as assessment of their relationship to versions in earlier literature is given in the introductions to sections of the commentary which are marked off by line numbers and headings. Use of sources is the aspect of Q.'s work as a whole that has received far more exhaustive treatment than any other, the standard treatments being Vian, *Recherches*, chapters 2,3 and 4 (17-144), as well as the introductions to individual books in the three volumes of his Budé

35 *Eccl. Hist.* 7.32.2-4, 8.1.4, 8.6.1-5.

36 Both of these identifications are made by Dorotheus' first editors. Of those who reviewed their edition in detail M. Fantuzzi ("La visione di Doroteo", *A & R* 30 [1985] 186-97) fully endorses both identifications. F. Vian ("À propos de la Vision de Dorothéos", *ZPE* 60 [1985] 45-49) is inclined to reject identification with Q. simply because of the great inferiority of Dorotheus' poetry; he makes the wholly unconvincing comment: "Il a certainement existé d'autres versificateurs qui ont porté le nom de Quintus." E. Livrea (*loc. cit.* n.31) accepts Vian's judgement without argument. The editors Kessels and Van der Horst (see n. 30, 316-7) conclude that "although certainty cannot be attained in this matter, there is some probability in the thesis that Dorotheus is the (Christian) son of the (pagan?) poet Quintus Smyrnaeus". G. Agosti (private communication dated 3.10.96), in addition to his published critique of alleged linguistic links and his attempt to support Livrea's interpretation of the colophon (see above), regards the inferiority of Dorotheus' metrical practice as militating against a father-son connection, but acknowledges the subjectivity of this conclusion.

edition (1963-9), and Keydell, *RE*, 1273-94. Also useful, esp. for lists of references, is M.-L. Mondino, *Alcune fonti* (1956). Here we confine ourselves to a few salient points concerning the principal sources for book 5.

In one sense the *Iliad* and the *Odyssey* are the primary sources of book 5, as they are for the rest of the *PH.*, in that their influence is pervasive and observable, as the commentary demonstrates, in almost every line, for words, for turns of expression and for incidental subject matter, notably in similes. A remarkable example of the subtlety of which Q. is capable with incidental H. reference is provided by 239, the first line of Odysseus' address to Ajax, which reflects two H. passages, both with pointed contextual links. But as regards subject matter on a substantial scale, book 5 contains only two episodes for which the primary models are H., 1-120 the ecphrasis of the armour of Achilles, mostly the scenes on the shield, which is indebted to its counterpart at Σ 478-613, and 618-63 the funeral of Ajax, indebted to that of Patroclus Ψ 110-256.

It might be expected that the relevant parts of the lost Cyclic epics would have been followed, at least in essentials, in Q.'s treatment of the same events. But it has been shown above in section A[37] that the known differences between them and the *PH.* make it unlikely that they were available to Q. The extent to which Q.'s version of the contest for the armour seems to differ from those of the *Aethiopis* and the *Little Iliad* is examined in the introduction to 121-79.

Of other Greek epic poetry the influence of Hesiod and Apollonius Rhodius is significant. Hesiod, *Op.* 287-92, is the primary literary source for the description of the mountain of Ἀρετή 49-56, and in parts of the shield description 3-101 the pseudo-Hesiodic *Scutum* is an important secondary influence. One line, 238 describing Odysseus and introducing his main speech, seems too similar to Hesiod, *Cat.* 198, for coincidence. In two passages subject matter is clearly derived from the *Argonautica*, though verbal similarity is largely avoided: 322-9, the physiological description of the onset of mental illness in Ajax, ~ A.R. 3.761-5, part of the description of Medea's emotional condition; 625-30, a mythological digression on the origin of Amber, ~ A.R. 4.603-11. On 322-3 remarkably close following of Apollonius' usage is noted with three rare compound verbs.

The one other work of Greek literature that can be shown to have substantial thematic influence is, not surprisingly, Sophocles' *Ajax*. But there is only one case of fairly close imitation: 470-5 ~ *Ajax* 835-44 in corresponding soliloquies of Ajax, though even here there are significant differences. The whole episode of the mourning and funeral of Ajax, 487-663, shows some indebtedness, esp. in the roles of Teucer, Tecmessa and Odysseus, but departs pointedly from Sophocles' version in the absence of

37 See esp. note 27.

disagreement over the treatment of Ajax's body and in the consistent magnanimity of Agamemnon.

As regards Latin literature, the much debated question of direct imitation of Virgil[38] hardly arises in book 5. A description of Enceladus in a simile 641-3 has some similarity to *Aeneid* 3.578-82, but is not close enough to prove influence. The one relevant source is Ovid's version of the contest between Ajax and Odysseus, *Met.* 13.1-381. The relationship between that and Q.'s version is examined in detail in the introductions to 180-317, 180-236 (Ajax's main speech) and 237-90 (Odysseus' main speech), with the conclusion supporting Keydell's argument (rejected by Vian) in favour of direct imitation. For further detailed support of the same conclusion see 194-6n., 229-34n., 290n.

C - BELIEFS AND INTERESTS

As regards the function of the traditional Olympian deities in the *PH.* it is impossible to make any positive deduction for the author's personal beliefs and attitudes, because obviously the undertaking to narrate the Trojan War in the H. manner entailed maintenance of what may be termed the H. divine machinery. The fact that Q. largely succeeds in this means that one can do little more than register the extent to which he differs from H., and that has been done in very similar terms by both Kakridis (164-78) and Vian I (xiv-xvi). The H. character of the deities is broadly maintained, and their intervention in the action of the narrative is at least as frequent as in the *Iliad.* Such intervention, however, is brief and perfunctory in a relatively large proportion of occurrences, and direct physical intervention, favoured in major combats of the *Iliad*, is largely avoided. One simply quantitative measure of this is the proportion of speeches spoken by deities, which is about 10 per cent in the *PH.* as a whole, compared with 27 per cent in the *Iliad.*[39] Also relatively few prophecies are made by deities.[40] In book 5 there is one case of sharp reduction of the traditional intervention by a deity, namely reduction of Athena's role in the story of the contest to infliction of Ajax's madness, on which see 121-79n. Distinctly unhomeric is the freedom from challenge enjoyed by the authority of Zeus, which is more or less identified with fate, a tendency that should perhaps be seen as reflecting the influence of Stoicism (see below). A tendency towards depersonalisation in this area can also be seen in the considerably greater prominence given to personifications of abstract qualities, which are already present in H., esp. of aspects of warfare, on which see 25-42n.

38 See, in addition to the standard treatments, H. Erbse, review of Vian, *Recherches* (*BZ* 54 [1961] 368-70) who concludes that Vian fails to disprove Keydell's case for direct imitation.

39 G. W. Elderkin, *Aspects of the Speech* (1906).

40 G. E. Duckworth, *Foreshadowing and Suspense* (1936), 64-65.

The passages containing personifications of this last type have been regarded as allegorical by some critics[41], which is questionable. Certainly there is a marked difference between these and the fully developed moral allegory of the mountain and tree of Virtue, 49-56, one of the scenes on the shield of Achilles. Essentially the same allegory is developed further at 14.195-200, where its unexplained introduction implies assumed knowledge of the earlier passage. Also the implied application of the first description to Achilles' character is confirmed by the second, which is spoken by Achilles' shade to his son in a dream. Although, as noted in section B, the primary literary model for the first passage is epic (Hesiod, *Op.* 287-92), it also draws on non-epic literary sources as well as, probably, some non-literary ones. Altogether it is a remarkable case of thematic originality. The possibility here of influence from visual art is one of several suggestions of such influence in the ecphrasis of the armour 1-120. The words used in 70 to describe Aphrodite rising from the sea may well be a pointed allusion to the famous painting by Apelles with that title. The following description of the wedding of Peleus and Thetis 73-79 is preceded in the *PH.* by three others (3.99-105, 4.50-54, 131-43), and it has been suggested that the prominence given to the subject may consciously reflect its popularity in visual art. The same could be true of the elaboration of the Titanomachy 103-9 in an otherwise brief description of Achilles' helmet. A greater awareness of visual effects on Q.'s part than in his H. model is noted at several points in the ecphrasis: see 6-16n., 65n., 103-4n.

The moral awareness of Q. and the influence on it of Stoicism has been the object of considerable comment, some of it unnecessarily negative. A. Koechly[42]lists the many moral commonplaces, or maxims, in the *PH.* and regards them as exhibiting an uncomfortable mix of traditional epic paganism with Stoic doctrine. G. W. Paschal[43] likewise lists commonplaces and observes that their use "detracts much, more than any other thing, from the H. character of Q.'s poem." Kakridis[44] notes that of about ninety commonplaces in the *PH.* approx. two-thirds are spoken by characters, with a heavy concentration, as one might expect, in the speeches firstly of Nestor and secondly of Odysseus. Finally the following observations are made by Vian[45]: in addition to the frequent use of moral commonplaces, some whole episodes in the *PH.* are obviously intended to be morally edifying[46]; Stoic beliefs are apparent in the omnipotence of fate and in the manner of the survival of human souls after death. In book 5 this last point would apply most obviously to the statement of Heracles' apotheosis 647-9, although that particular case is firmly based in a tradition going back to H. There is, incidentally, nothing in the *PH.* close enough to Christian belief to establish any influence, in spite of the ascertainable circumstances of his

41 Vian III 48 n.2; Campbell on 12.437-8.

42 Ed. 1850, *proleg.* xcv-xcvi

43 *A Study* (1904), 44.

44 178-81.

45 I xvi-xviii, xxxvi-xxxvii.

46 Cf. comments below in D - Characterisation.

life, for which see section A, esp. n. 36. Vian also notes[47] the similarity of Nestor's consolation of Podalirius, 7.37-92, to Seneca's *Consolatio ad Marciam*.[48] In this connection a further point to be made about the moral allegory discussed above is that it is closely linked to the repeated commonplace of toil as a necessary means to virtue or glory, esp. 12.292-6. All the commonplaces in book 5 are spoken appropriately in character and so are not alien from H. usage. They are as follows. Tecmessa: 553-6 fatherless children have much to suffer. Nestor: 155-6 knowledgeable old age is superior in counsel; 605-6 excessive mourning is wrong; 610-1 the dead cannot be raised by expression of grief. Odysseus: 242-52 (by far the most elaborate utterance of this kind) intelligence is superior in practical achievements as well as in counsel; 574-5 anger is a great evil; 595-7 excessive grief is wrong because a wise man suffers with equanimity. This last echoes what is said about Nestor 3.8-9 and is an obvious expression of the Stoic moral ideal of ἀπάθεια.

One passage in book 5 calls for special attention in this section, that is the remarkably detailed physiological description of the onset of mental illness in Ajax 322-9. As noted in the commentary, it has points of close contact with the equally detailed description of the onset of glaucoma in Laocoön 12.399-415. Both are very probably original embellishments to the traditional stories and need to be seen in relation to a few other passages: 1.76-82 a long simile on the treatment of eyes, for which there is no known precedent; repeated attention to the treatment of injuries in the funeral games of Achilles 4.211-4, 396-404, 538-40, another seemingly original embellishment; 9.428-9 mention of the washing of a wound. All this amounts to substantial evidence of personal interest, possibly professional interest, in medical matters[49] on Q.'s part, which is the more striking for the epic impersonality that he maintains with almost complete consistency in his work.

D - CHARACTERISATION

By far the fullest treatment of characterisation in the *PH*. is that of M.W. Mansur, *The Treatment of Homeric Characters by Q. of S.* (1940), 1-81. Also relevant are Kakridis, 133-47, L. Ferrari, *Osservazioni su Q. S.* (1963), ch. 4, and Vian, *passim* in *Recherches* (1959) and his edition (1963-9). The views of these critics will be noted in connection with the principal characters of book 5. Here we confine ourselves to noting that it is hard to disagree with Mansur's overall assessment, endorsed explicitly by Kakridis: Q. exhibits a strong tendency to idealise his characters, emphasising their

47 II, 97n. 2.

48 For discussion of some other cases of Stoic influence in the *PH*. see F. A. García Romero, "Estoicismo", *Emer.* 58 (1990) 119-24.

49 For an example of medical practice combined with poetic production see Theocritus 11.1-6, 28.6-7, 19-21, T.'s friend Nicias of Miletus.

virtues and minimising their faults. He does this more by selective use of the tradition than by innovation, and this results in some loss of liveliness, esp. when compared with the H. counterparts, although there is some compensation in the sensitivity with which shades of feeling are sometimes expressed. Clearly it is legitimate to relate these observations to that of the moralising tendency made above in section C.

The dominant character in book 5 is Ajax son of Telamon, and it is no exaggeration to say that in it he virtually fulfils the role of tragic hero. As such his presentation naturally invites comparison with that in Sophocles' *Ajax*. The latter's emphasis on excessive pride is largely absent and, as noted 128-38n., the result is an approximation to the heroic ideal that is markedly less appealing. Compared with the *Iliad*, Mansur justly observes that Q.'s Ajax is relatively uninteresting partly because he lacks the distinctive H. combination of physical strength and dullness of wit. In the introduction to 180-317 Q.'s avowed prejudice in favour of Ajax (129-33) is shown to be consistently reflected in Q.'s version of his contest with Odysseus. It differs strikingly from those of Antisthenes and Ovid in that Odysseus, although the winner, is not given a longer or more impressive speech than Ajax, indeed his case is weakened by palpably failing to answer several of Ajax's charges. Ajax's superiority in the contest and the consequent injustice of his defeat is foreshadowed, as Vian notes[50], in books 3 and 4 by his dominance in the fight over Achilles' body and in the funeral games. The favourable characterisation of Ajax is further supported by the following points in the narrative of book 5. At 318-32 the Greek army's negative reaction to the Trojans' judgement shows its sympathy for Ajax, whilst the description of the latter's reaction presents his condition in pathological rather than moral terms. In the night of Ajax's madness 352-94 his dignity is preserved by focusing mainly on his strength. At 428-38 Agamemnon refrains from questioning Menelaus' prejudice in favour of Ajax, and then the latter's crime is minimised by allowing the shepherds to escape, seemingly against the tradition. Finally, the close parallel between the mourning and funeral of Ajax 487-663 and those of Achilles 3.385-787 serves to underline the similar status accorded to the two heroes and therefore the validity of Ajax's claim to the prize, as is made explicit at 658.

Ajax's gain is inevitably Odysseus' loss, and, as Mansur observes, some degree of inconsistency is incurred as regards Odysseus' characterisation in that his contest with Ajax is the one notable exception to the rule in the *PH.* of Odysseus appearing to advantage as a speaker. But it should be emphasised that even here Q., in keeping with his general tendency towards idealisation, avoids anything of the extreme negativism of some posthomeric characterisation of Odysseus, embraced even by Sophocles and Euripides.[51] The lowest point that Q. allows him to touch is his claim at 285-6 to the leading role in rescuing Achilles' body, which because it contradicts the narrative at 3.212-387 presents him undeniably as a liar. In

50 I, 90 and 132

51 Cf. esp. Sophocles' *Philoctetes*, Euripides' *Hecuba* and *Troades*.

his lament for Ajax 574-97 the expression of regret over his victory is obviously insincere, and his moral criticism, expressed in Stoic terms, is more characteristic of Nestor.

Immediately afterwards, 600-11, Nestor intervenes characteristically, enjoining moderation in mourning in much the same terms as at 3.514-25. Earlier, in his speech of advice, 141-64, which is crucial for the conduct of the contest, he shows exemplary diplomacy in his balanced assessment of Odysseus and Ajax. The ready deference to Nestor by Agamemnon at that point may well reflect the version of the story attributed to the *Little Iliad*, even though that is not followed by Q. in some respects.[52] In general terms Q.'s characterisation of Nestor differs from H.'s only in that his speeches avoid excessive length and irrelevant reminiscence, as Mansur notes—again more edifying but less interesting.

Mansur also correctly observes that Agamemnon is another character who in the *PH*. loses something of his H. individuality, mainly his shortcomings as a leader. In fact his most distinctive trait is the positive one that appears, to some extent against the tradition, in book 5, his magnanimity towards Ajax after his death.

One formal feature of Q.'s art relevant to characterisation is the use of speeches. That will be given full consideration below in section E; here it is sufficient to note that there is no significant departure from the H. practice of presenting characters through a fairly even balance of speech and narrative. A more important feature for the light that it throws on the present topic is the pervasive sense of what we may term epic dignity. That is clearly connected with Q.'s tendency both to moralise and to idealise. Both Vian (I, xxxv-xxxvii) and Kakridis (143-6) recognise that these tendencies lead to some loss of individuality and liveliness in Q.'s characters.

It may be helpful to conclude this section with some points in book 5, some of them already touched upon, that suggest conscious maintenance of dignity. When Ajax and Odysseus first make their claims to the armour 128-38, there is no hint that unseemly violence could result. The night of Ajax's madness is described 352-94 with a vagueness that is supported by elaborate use of similes. Ajax's speech of triumph over a slaughtered ram 439-50 is a more dignified alternative for the mutilation and flogging in Sophocles' version. This is in keeping with the most important departure from Sophocles in Q.'s account of the mourning and funeral of Ajax, the absence of any unseemly dispute over treatment of the body. The memory of Ajax's fatal loss is veiled by the final dignified image at 650-1 of his body in its armour on the pyre. One may well conclude that at least in book 5 there is no less gain than loss resulting from Q.'s sense of dignity.

---

52 See 121-79n.

E - NARRATIVE TECHNIQUE

The narrative structure of the *PH.* as a whole is a subject of considerable interest, but not of direct relevance to an appreciation of book 5. Suffice it to record in passing that the latest treatment of it[53] makes considerable and well founded claims for the work's large-scale organisation, in contrast to the tendency to dismiss it as merely episodic.[54] The aspect of book 5, esp. of the contest but also of the mourning, that is likely to impress the reader most strongly is its rhetoric, as was already observed by Eustathius.[55] The prominence of rhetoric makes it something of an exception in the work as a whole. The relatively unrhetorical character of much of the *PH.* is indeed an important measure of Q.'s success in reproducing the H. manner, but that does not justify such exaggerations as Keydell's[56] that Q. generally avoids rhetorical embellishment. The only systematic treatment of this aspect of the *PH.* is that by Vian (I, xxxviii-xl). He recognises the pervasive influence of rhetoric, mainly on the speeches, for which he gives full references according to traditional thematic categories. The most elaborate analysis in rhetorical terms of the speeches of the contest in book 5 is that by G. W. Elderkin (*Aspects of the Speech*), to which reference is made in the introductions to 180-317 and 180-236; see also 139-64n., 439-50n.

It is helpful to begin consideration of the speeches in book 5 with the quantitative observations made by Elderkin[57]. Speeches constitute a markedly smaller proportion of the whole *PH.* (24 per cent) than they do of the *Iliad* (44 per cent) and the *Odyssey* (56 per cent), as well as of the later *Dionysiaca* of Nonnus (36 per cent), but only a little less than of Apollonius' *Argonautica* (29 per cent). But book 5, not surprisingly, has by far the largest proportion of speeches in the *PH.*, 45 per cent, practically the same as that of the *Iliad.* As regards the average length of speeches, Q.'s (for the whole *PH.*) is about the same as Apollonius', just under 12 lines, a little more than the H. average of 10.6 lines, and much less than Nonnus' 25 lines, an important measure of the much more rhetorical character of the *Dionysiaca.* Forensic oratory is, of course, the category represented by the speeches of Ajax and Odysseus in the contest, for which Q. may well be alone in the literary tradition in adhering to the Athenian courtroom practice of giving each party the right to reply with a second, relatively short, speech—Ajax 181-236 plus 292-305, Odysseus 239-90 plus 307-16. For detailed analysis and consideration of how far these speeches conform to forensic practice see the introductions in the commentary. The two longer

53 P. Schenk, "Handlungsstruktur und Komposition in den *PH.* des Q. S.", *RM* 140 (1997) 363-85.

54 Most recently by W. Appel, "Grundsätzliche Bemerkungen zu den *PH.* und Q. S.", *Prometheus* 20 (1994) 1-13.

55 On λ 546 (1698.48f).

56 *RE* 1295.

57 *Op. cit.*

speeches are the most elaborate examples of rhetorical set pieces in the *PH*. In the case of Ajax Q.'s determination to make his case appear the stronger, noted above in section D, produces a display of rhetorical skill that is hardly compatible with his traditional character. The second most elaborate example of rhetorical set pieces in book 5 is the series of three speeches of lament for Ajax, by Teucer (509-20), Tecmessa (532-58) and Odysseus (574-97). These have close links with the laments for Achilles in book 3 by Ajax, Phoenix, Agamemnon, Briseis and Thetis, and are an effective means of underlining the similar status of the two heroes. Ajax's insane speech of mocking triumph over a slaughtered ram (441-8) is a unique variation on the H. convention of formal expression of insults over a dead or dying enemy, of which there are seven other examples in the *PH*. The one example of soliloquy in book 5 (there are four others in the *PH*., compared with eleven in the *Iliad* and ten in the *Odyssey*), that of Ajax deciding on suicide, 465-81, belongs to a distinctively H. type of soliloquy of decision. As noted above in section B, it owes something to the corresponding soliloquy in Sophocles' *Ajax* (815-65). Dialogue features prominently in book 5 by virtue of the fact that, as Elderkin[58] recognises, the whole of the contest can be regarded as such. Although Q. follows forensic practice in the allocation of speeches, he departs from it in making the speakers address not the court but one another, which is a concession to the rule in H. debate. Also much of the introduction to the contest, 139-74, is a dialogue between Nestor and Agamemnon. In addition there is a brief dialogue between Menelaus and Agamemnon at 413-32. This has been unjustly dismissed as weakly linked to the surrounding narrative[59], whereas it is in fact an effective device for increasing dramatic tension, with the irony of Menelaus' wrong supposition that the Greeks and their ships are in danger from Ajax.

This last instance of irony is of the dramatic kind, because Menelaus cannot know the truth. But the one other noteworthy use of irony in book 5, Odysseus' claim that Ajax's anger was unexpected in a contest about prowess, 589-93, is ambiguous as to whether the speaker is conscious of it. One figure of thought often associated with rhetorical effects is paradox, but the only example of it noted in book 5 is the digression on personified Sleep, 395-403, leading to the paradox of Sleep going to bed when others wake up. The example of dramatic tension at 413-32, noted above, is similar to that created by Agamemnon's mistaken prediction at 173-4 that resentment from the loser in the contest will be directed against the Trojans, not the Greeks. Suspense on a small scale at a pivotal point in the narrative, 319-20, arises from careful postponement of the winner's name to the end of the sentence. Dramatic tension is obviously the main purpose of postponing Ajax's anticipated action to the following day, seemingly against the tradition, with description of an intervening night, 352-94. Finally the book closes on a note of dramatic tension, the Greeks' stated fear of a Trojan attack after Ajax's death, 661-3. Q.'s keen sense of dramatic effect is also

58 *Op. cit.*

59 Vian, II 16; Keydell *RE* .1281

shown in the contrivance of climax on both a small and a large scale. The shield scene of macabre personifications of warfare, 29-40, is built up through progressively more elaborate descriptions. Then the whole series of shield scenes is brought to a climax with the last two developed at greater length, 80-96. The culmination of an unusual series of similes, 364-89, is marked with some thematic echoing of the first in the last and a closer parallel to the narrative action. Perhaps the most impressive and subtle climax in the book is achieved by the series of comparisons between Ajax and legendary figures of self-destructive strength, marked by progressive elaboration—Orion 404, Typhon 485, Enceladus 641-3, Heracles 644-9.

Effects of tension and climax are often naturally connected with the purposeful use of foreshadowing, and that is an aspect of the *PH.* to which a substantial study has been devoted, G. E. Duckworth, "Foreshadowing and Suspense in the *PH.* of Q. of S.", *AJP* 57 (1936) 58-86. His main conclusion is rather negative, that Q.'s frequent use of foreshadowing is applied mostly to short terms, so that it does not contribute greatly to the unity of the epic as a whole. Our own observation of its use in book 5 reveals an almost equal balance between use for effect within a relatively short passage on the one hand (7 ~ 14-16, 45-48 ~ 49-68, 80 ~ 81-87, 311-2 ~ 318-20, 453-5 ~ 470-5, 522-5 ~ 547-9, 526-8 ~ 551-6) and on the other hand for anticipating relatively remote events: 4.461-2 ~ 5.224-8, Ajax's ability to wear the armour of Achilles no less than that of Memnon; 173-4 ~ 352 ff., the anger of the loser against the Trojans or the Greeks; 257-62 ~ books 7 and 9, Odysseus' ability to secure the help of others; 321~568-9, the army's groaning at the judgement and in mourning for Ajax; 331-2 ~ 482-6, the death of Ajax; 474-5 ~ the *Odyssey*, etc., Agamemnon's death at his homecoming; 587-8 ~ 7.194 ff., Odysseus' readiness to give up the armour of Achilles. It is certainly no exaggeration to say that this device substantially enriches the poetry.

Vian makes the rather condescending comment[60] that Q. exhibits a schoolmasterish taste for digression, or brief notes, on varied topics, esp. on mythology. Book 5 is indeed marked by considerable use of mythological digression, and the following is an attempt at unprejudiced appraisal. The arrival of Thetis and the Nereids prompts a digression, 338-45, on the link between the marriage of Peleus and Thetis and the punishment of Prometheus. The former is mentioned several times in the *PH.* as background to the career of Achilles, but even so its relevance here to the death of Ajax is at best very indirect, and Vian's criticism 'maladroit' is justified. Information on the source of some wine, 350-1, is gratuitous, but brief enough not to be disturbing. The arrival of dawn prompts a digression, 396-403, on the departure of personified Sleep, with elaborate recollection of the H. Deception of Zeus, ending with a link to waking in the narrative. The poetic motive of this is formal balance with the digression at 338-45 and its link with the preceding sunset. There is weakness in the tenuous thematic connection between myth and narrative. Personification of Madness

60 I, xxxvii - xxxviii.

leads into a digression, 452-5, on the function of the Erinyes, which seems irrelevant until it proves to be a precise foreshadowing of Ajax's curse at 470-5. Finally an elaborate digression, 625-30, on the origin of amber from the tears of the mourning Heliades contributes effectively to the mood of the narrative context. Altogether the success of these digressions is very mixed; some are disturbing for lack of relevance, whilst others make a positive contribution to the poetry comparable with that of the similes.

The technique of marking the end of sense units with verbal or thematic echoes from the beginning, known as ring composition, is applied in book 5 to speeches, digressions and other kinds of passage. The long ecphrasis of Achilles' shield begins and ends (resp. 4 and 97-98) with naming of its maker Hephaestus. A particularly long simile ends at 378 with a thematic reprise from 373-4. The closing point of Menelaus' speech at 415-26 echoes with variation its opening. Verbal and thematic echoes mark off Ajax's speech of mocking, 439-50, as they do Nestor's speech of advice, 601-11. Agamemnon's speech of consolation ends at 566-7 with the same point that begins Tecmessa's preceding lament, 532-3. And lastly repetition at 630 of a key word from 625 marks off the digression on amber.

Similes, both brief and developed, are a prominent feature of the *PH.*, no less than of the *Iliad.* Their manner and their content are very largely H. Comments like that of C.-A. Sainte-Beuve[61], that they render the *PH.* "plus homérique qu' Homère", are typical and justified, even though close inspection reveals considerable originality. There have been four systematic studies of them, three published and one unpublished. Koechly (ed. 1850, *proleg.* lxxxi-lxxxiv) details their linguistic features. Among the findings of K.A.E. Niemeyer (*Ueber die Gleichnisse bei Q.S.*, Zwickau 1883-4) is that the frequency of similes in the *PH.* far exceeds that in the *Iliad*, one per 40 lines as opposed to one per 77 lines. Vian ("Les comparaisons de Q. de. S.". *RP* 28 [1954] 30-51 & 235-43) analyses repeated themes, use of H. models, self-imitation and progressive development. The unpublished study is that of T. Roberts (*A Study of the Similes of Late Greek Epic*, MA [Hons] thesis, University of Sydney 1986). He analyses elements, themes, clusters and connections, and provides exhaustive lists for Q. and other relevant poets. There is also a bare list of Q.'s similes, arranged thematically, in Way's Loeb edition (1913, pp. 627-8). The following are the similes in book 5 in order of occurrence: 107 thunderbolts like snowflakes, 119 a spear like pine trees, 131-2 Ajax like the evening star, 188 Odysseus and Ajax like a dog and a lion, 298-9 Ajax and the Trojans like an eagle with geese and cranes, 364-9 Ajax like a storm at sea, 371-8 Ajax like a wild animal robbed of its young, 380-4 Ajax like a cauldron of boiling water, 386-9 Ajax like the sea, a wind or a forest fire, 396 Sleep like a breeze, 404 Ajax like Orion, 406-7 Ajax like a hungry lion, 409-10 Ajax and some sheep like the North wind and leaves, 435-7 Ajax and some shepherds like an eagle and hares, 461-2 Ajax like a mountain peak, 485 Ajax like Typhon, 493-6 Ajax and the Greeks like lambs and ewes, 503-6 Teucer like an orphaned child, 641-3

61 *Quintus de Smyrne et son épopée* (Paris 1870, written 1856).

Ajax like Enceladus, 644-9 Ajax like Heracles. For all these the commentary provides full discussion on use of sources and on degrees of originality. The total of 20 similes in a book of 663 lines gives a frequency of approx. one per 33 lines, considerably higher than that calculated by Niemeyer for the whole *PH.* The most remarkable feature of those in book 5 is that all but three short ones and one developed one are applied to Ajax, most conspicuously with the series of four elaborate similes between 364 and 389. Accordingly this can be seen as an effective device for highlighting the status of Ajax as the hero of the book.

The long series of elaborately described scenes in the ecphrasis of the armour of Achilles, 1-120, like its H. model in Σ, has more or less close thematic links with the similes of H. and Q. For full discussion of Q.'s use of ecphrasis and its place in the whole poetic tradition see the introduction to 1-120.

Vian has shown[62] that much of the narrative of the *PH.*, like that of the H. epics, consists of variations on traditional themes or motifs, which he illustrates with analysis of the preliminaries of battles. Also Campbell[63] has some discussion of similar phenomena: see his Index A2, "Typical scenes and situations". The one example of something like a typical scene that has been noted in book 5 is 348-54, one of five similar scenes in the *PH.* contrasting general rest with the restlessness of an individual. For all the epic fullness of most of Q.'s narrative, which he would have been justified in regarding as a H. quality, at times he, no less than H., employs remarkable brevity. Each case should be judged without prejudice, and we should not be too ready with such dismissive comments as Campbell's on 12.353-9: "Q. tells his story in the manner of a crude summariser." The extreme brevity with which the conditions of the award of the armour are stated at 125 may be criticised as exploitation of the assumed familiarity of the story.[64] The bare initial mention of the rival statements of claim by Ajax and Odysseus at 128 has the virtue of not weakening the impact of the following speeches. The narrative leading from Agamemnon's decision to make Trojans act as judges to the opening speech of the contest, 175-9, is kept to a bare minimum, and this has the effect of maximising focus on the speeches. At 482-4 there is dignity in the laconic brevity with which Ajax's suicide is narrated, as also in the brief paratactic statements at 651-2 describing the crowd at Ajax's funeral. Finally at 653-6 economy is achieved in the minimal account of Ajax's burial through assumed recollection of the much more elaborate one of Achilles' burial at 3.719-42, and possible tedium is thus avoided. In all but one of these examples brevity can certainly be seen as a virtue.

A poet who has the disadvantage of being not only imitative but late is always liable to be appraised with less generosity or open-mindedness than

62 *Recherches*, 175-82.

63 *A Commentary on Q.S. 'PH.' XII* (1981).

64 See 121-79n. and cf. Campbell on the bare first mention of the making of a horse at 12.28.

one who either belongs to a classical canon or is part of a fashionable critical rehabilitation like those of the Hellenistic period. It is undeniable that criticism of the *PH.* has often been vitiated by negative prejudice, weakness being identified without sufficient thought being given to the possibility of different and more positive interpretation. For example the deficiencies of Odysseus' main speech, 239-90, have been attributed by Kakridis[65] and Vian[66] to authorial incompetence or ignorance, without considering that they are part of the consistent presentation of Ajax's case as the stronger, against the prevailing tradition. Even the alleged implausibility of there being many helpless witnesses to Ajax's suicide, as implied at 487-9, can be explained partly in terms of heroic convention and partly by vagueness (presumably intended) over the location of the action. On the other hand, the statement at 97-98 that there were many more scenes on the shield of Achilles is, it must be said, a rather weak attempt to suggest something more impressive, and it can be paralleled at 6.292-3 and 12.519-20. The only case of outright inconsistency found in the narrative of book 5 is the citing by Odysseus at 278-81 of an achievement (his spying in Troy) that according to the tradition did not occur until later in the war.

F - LANGUAGE AND STYLE

The standard and only systematic treatment of the language of the *PH.* is still that of Koechly in the *prolegomena* of his edition of 1850 (xliv-xciii), to which chapters 5 and 6 of Vian's *Recherches* constitute a substantial supplement. However, the principal resource in this field is the exhaustive data provided by Vian and Battegay, *Lexique de Q. de S.* Probably no other poem on a comparable scale reproduces the language of its models as closely as does the *PH.* that of the H. epics. Consequently, much of the detail of any commentary on it must concern the extent to which any given word or expression is H., with note taken of any non-H. influence. Such is the practice of the present commentary, and here nothing more is attempted than to call attention to some linguistic and stylistic features of particular interest.

One way of measuring how far Q.'s language is H. is simply to list parts of speech according to whether they occur in H. or not. This Koechly does for nouns and adjectives[67], demonstrating the great preponderance of H. words but not giving any comparative totals. That is done by Vian for adjectives[68], 720 being H. and 220 non-H. Of the 720 H. adjectives in the *PH.* he lists 149 that are used 10 times or more, noting that 60 are more frequent in Q. than in H. If there is a criticism to be made of Q. in this area it is that he exaggerates the H. manner by excessive use of ornamental

65 60-61.
66 II 13 n.4.
67 *Op. cit.* lv-lxiv.
68 *Op. cit.*, 182-92.

adjectives, thereby weakening their effect at times. The following cases of overworked adjectives are noted: ἀλεγεινός 18n., ἀμείλιχος 34n., ἀμύμων 399n., ἀπειρέσιος 11n., ἀργαλέος 240n., ὄβριμος 20n., σμερδαλέος 17-19n., στονόεις 185n. Excessive concentrations of adjectives are noted 20n. and 73-75n. One significant limitation to Q.'s imitation of H. is that, unlike his Hellenistic predecessors, he shows no liking for rare or unique H. words of disputed meaning, so-called glosses[69]. The only example in book 5 is ἠιόεν 299, for which he makes a clear choice between disputed H. meanings.

Two formal features of H. Greek that are markedly different from classical Attic are the uses of the syllabic augment in verbs and of the so-called definite article, and in both Q. adheres closely to H. practice. The complex matter of use and omission of the syllabic augment in the *PH.* is given full treatment by Vian[70]. Occasionally this involves difficult decisions for the text: see 48n., 240n., 547n., 602n., 660n. As regards the definite article, the closeness of Q.'s usage to H.'s (markedly closer than is that of Apollonius Rhodius) has been demonstrated by A. Svensson[71].

Occasionally Q. sees fit to be more distinctively epic than is strictly warranted by H. practice, avoiding words or forms common in prose: see 219n. δεδουπώς favoured as an equivalent to τεθνηκώς, 262n. κάρτος preferred to κράτος, 414n. ποτὶ μῦθον ἔειπε in place of H. πρὸς μ. ἔ. Q. very largely succeeds in avoiding distinctively Attic forms[72]; the only examples noted in the commentary are -η for -εα in τεύχη (2, 227, 230, 442), -αις for -ῃς in ἀγρόταις (374), -ᾶς for -έας in ἡμᾶς (417), καλὸν with short α (530). The influence of Attic is discernible in one feature of Q.'s syntax, marked preference for the subjunctive over the optative, even where the latter would be usual, in historic sequence, according to H. usage: see 280-1n., 380n. A matter that seems not to have been noted elsewhere, Q.'s quite striking tendency to substitute middle for active forms of verbs, is best explained by influence of prose usage, since later Atticising writers often made excessive use of middle verbs[73]: see 318n., 466n., 485n., 510n., 565n., 579n., 602n. Other cases of influence from prose usage, both Attic and later prose[74], have been noted as follows: 91 πεπληγότες with a passive meaning, 157 an Attic legal expression in a modified form, 171-2 ὄφρα dependent on μενοινᾷ, 206 ὡς (αἴθ') ὄφελον as an adverb with the indicative (20 times), 207-9 (and 220-2) a final clause with ὄφρα and aorist

69 See Koechly, *proleg.* xlix; Campbell, Index A 1 (iii) a.

70 *Recherches* 220-6.

71 *Der Gebrauch des bestimmten Artikels in der nachklassischen griechischen Epik* (Lund 1937), 77-89.

72 See Koechly, *proleg.* li-liii; Vian, *Recherches* 168-74.

73 See E. Schwyzer, *Griech. Grammatik* 2.234-5; Campbell on 12.435.

74 For the alleged influence of the contemporary vernacular on Q.'s usage (esp. prepositions, particles and moods) see Keydell, *RE* 1294. Whilst this cannot be completely excluded, it is obvious that the language which influenced Q. was very largely literary, although the examples do not permit identification of particular authors or types of literature apart from the main poetic sources.

indicative, 277 ὑπέρ plus genitive = 'concerning', 281 an indirect question in historic sequence with present indicative, 293 ἐκεῖσε = ἐκεῖ, 510 οἷ αὐτῷ = σοὶ αὐτῷ, 515 δεῦρο = ἐνθάδε. Such occasional divergences from the language of early epic poetry are remarkable chiefly for their paucity. They are to be expected from a poet who was by no means slavishly imitative, but, like most of his kind, clearly prided himself on some modest linguistic originality, enriching the epic tradition with innovation in both forms and meanings of words, mostly on the analogy of epic precedents. Originality of this kind, which is always provisional, dependent on the available data, has been noted in the following categories: syntactical usage, word forms, compound words (including several *hapax legomena*), application of epithets, meanings of words, novel or unusual expressions; for references see the index of subjects.

To turn from strictly linguistic points to the style of the *PH.*, the tendency of epic language to favour paratactic juxtaposition, more so than in prose, explains the use of paratactic δέ at 7, 236 and 652, where logical subordination might have been expected. Very rarely one must simply note carelessness or awkwardness of expression: 27-28 three successive dative forms with the first two depending on the third, 51 a redundant preposition after a double compound verb, 313 a three-word parenthesis interrupting the main construction, 358 two adverbs together in asyndeton, 492 a dative pronoun and a genitive participle juxtaposed. More often, however, irregularity of expression seems to be used for intended stylistic effect, e.g. 375-8 the anacoluthon of a nominative left without a finite verb and followed by a new clause with δέ. The slightly unnatural combination of expressions known as zeugma occurs at 154 and 179, and transferred epithets at 28, 50, 161 and 385. A few cases of ellipsis of expression or thought (27-28, 134, 157, 176, 177-8, 366-9) do not cause serious difficulty; twice (309-10, 476) it seems to be intended as informality of expression in speeches. More typically the language of epic poetry is characterised by fullness, and the *PH.* is no exception. Frequent use is made of traditional periphrasis with βίη, ἔργα, κῆρ, μένος, σθένος and υἷες and the genitive of names or common nouns. Pleonasm is noted at 171n. and 583n., and tautology at 21n., 155-6n., 204-5n. and 518-9n.

Comparison of formulaic repetition in H. and Q. will be made in section G. Here we are concerned only with repetition of single words and phrases within short passages, with or without intended effect. The fullest treatment of this kind of repetition is that of L. Castiglioni ("Intorno a Q.S.", *Byz.-Neugriech. Jahrb.* 2 [1921], 33-52), who concentrates on negative aspects, listing esp. excessive use of adjectives (see above) and weak repetition within short passages. Kakridis[75] gives examples of repetition for calculated effect, esp. anaphora, and Campbell[76] makes the salutary comment that Q. is often unfairly judged for repetition that simply belongs to the H. manner. In

75 199-200

76 On 12.521-2

the commentary we note seventeen cases of single words repeated within a passage, six of two words and three of three words. Most of these are not accidental, but made for intended effect, and so are best regarded as a rhetorical device. Conscious variation of expression is exceptional but not unknown: see 5n. and 348n. for variation of epithets, 8n. for variation of adverbs introducing scenes in the ecphrasis, and 243-50n. for synonyms in varied parts of sentences. One form of variation found occasionally is unusual word order for calculated effect, esp. emphasis conveyed by noticeable separation of grammatically linked words, for which see 39n., 207-9n., 251-2n., 276-7n., 326-7n., 570n. Nine examples of chiasmus are noted, and they all serve to underline contrasted statements; six have the pattern ABBA, and other patterns are ABCCBA (100-1), ABCCA (430-1), ABCBCA (563-4). Sound effects—alliteration, assonance and rhyme—are not a prominent feature of Q.'s style, and it is not always possible to be sure whether they are for intended effect, but occasionally they certainly are. Of six noted cases of rhyme in book 5 two seem accidental (76, 103-4), three underline contrasted statements (81-82, 321, 326-7) and one recalls a similar effect in a H. model (21). Of nine noted cases of alliteration and assonance only two are certainly for intended effect, both in the same speech (441, 448), whilst one recalls a similar effect in a H. model (628). Equally rare is play on words. Only two clear examples have been noted in book 5: at 31 the unusual association of Ἔρις and Ἐρινύες implies a (false) etymological link between the words; at 69-70 εὐφροσύνης, ἀφρὸν and ἀνεδύετο all allude to the name Aphrodite. Finally, as in the H. epics, metaphors are neither frequent nor striking in the *PH.*, in contrast to the frequent use of similes, for which see section E. Examples have been noted as follows: 169-70n., 322n., 324n., 369n. and 388n., 381n., 423n., 444n., 552n., 579n.

G - FORMULAE

Milman Parry in his study *L' Épithète traditionelle dans Homère*[77] supplemented his analysis of the formulaic system of H. noun-epithet combinations by briefly comparing the use of epithets by Apollonius Rhodius and Virgil. The relatively very limited use of epithets by these poets, as well as their function in a way that is more often contextually significant than purely ornamental, led Parry to the following conclusion: "The hexameter of another age could never be traditional except in so far as it imitated a style other than its own, i.e. that of H. And as we have seen in the case of Apollonius and Virgil, this imitation did not go far." Later, in the first of his Harvard articles[78], he made a more extensive comparison of the nature of verbal repetition in Archaic and Classical Greek poetry and concluded: "We have found that formulas are to all purposes altogether

---

77 Published 1928, and then in English translation by A. Parry in *The Making of Homeric Verse*, 1971.

78 "Studies in the Epic Technique of Oral Verse-Making", *HSPh* 41 (1930) 73-147.

lacking in verse which we know was written." A correction of Parry in this matter was made by A. Hoekstra, in his *Homeric Modifications of Formulaic Prototypes* (1965), and we quote his remarks[79] in full.

> [Parry] certainly did not prove...that only an oral poet can adopt a formulaic diction which has previously been created. Nor would he have been able to prove this, for tradition has preserved a work which is large enough to show that a literate poet can adopt such a diction. It is the *PH.* of Q.S., who, in this respect, probably imitated H. more closely than H. followed his predecessors. [He] even works out in a formulaic manner certain expressions which are sporadically found in H. [and] makes new (if analogical) formulae, e.g. ἐυμμελίης Ἀγαμέμνων (7x), ἐυμμελίην (-η) Ἀχιλῆα (-ι) (3x), in which ἐυμμελίης is treated in the same way as the 'generic epithets' examined by Parry. ... So if...the *PH.* were the oldest surviving piece of poetry, the argument put forth [by Parry] would necessarily lead to the conclusion that this poem was an oral composition.

Hoekstra did not take the matter any further, and it is precisely the purpose of this section to demonstrate the truth of his observations, and also to correct them.

Actually earlier than Hoekstra's work, but not referred to by him, is the standard study of the formulaic character of Q.'s language, that of Vian in his *Recherches*, ch. 6 "Technique formulaire et procédés de style". He notes that precisely repeated formulae are mostly very short, rarely as long as a complete line, and that Q. operates constantly with variations on stock expressions. He lists all repeated formulae involving adjectives in alphabetic order of adjectives; of the total of 180 such formulae 76 are H. In our commentary we have used the term formula for any expression of two or more words used two or more times in the whole *PH.* Precise observation of the rare repetition of whole lines in the *PH.* seems to have been made first by Elderkin[80], who notes nine cases of a single line repeated once, one pair of lines repeated once (3.465-6 = 5.538-9, apparently the longest *verbatim* repetition in the *PH.*), and one line repeated 4x (7.219, ὣς φάμενον προσέειπεν Ἀχιλλέος ὄβριμος υἱός, = 7.700 = 8.146 = 12.66 = 13.237, the only real example in the *PH.* of a whole line functioning as a formula in the H. manner). In the commentary we have noted six cases of whole lines repeated precisely— 5.165 = 5.427, 5.317 = 5.598, 5.531 = 13.271, 5.568 = 3.504, 5.603 = 6.21, 5.654 = 3.723, and one of a whole line repeated with modification 5.155 ~ 5.252. Of the total of 103 shorter formulae noted in the commentary 61 consist of only 2 words, 31 consist of 3 words, 8 of 4 words, and 3 of 5 words. The totals of occurrences in the whole *PH.* are as follows: 40 occur 2x, 19 occur 3x, 15 occur 4x, 9 occur 5x, 3 occur 6x, 7 occur 7x, 2 occur 8x, 3 occur 10x, 2 occur 12x, 1 occurs

---

79 *Op. cit.* 17. Parry's observations on Virgil's formularity have been superseded by W. Moskalew's standard treatment, *Formular Language and Poetic Design in the Aeneid* (Leiden 1982).

80 *Aspects of the Speech* (1906).

15x, 1 occurs 19x (ὣς ἄρ' ἔφη), and 1 occurs 22x (Τρώιοι υἷες). These figures fully support Vian's observation that Q.'s formulae are mostly very short, to which it may be added that only a small proportion have a noteworthy frequency of 6x or more — 20 out of a 103. The commonest grammatical combination is a noun and adjective (27), followed by a noun and dependent genitive (10).

The closely related matter of Q.'s use of epithets, i.e. their application to heroic names compared with the practice of H., has been the object of one systematic study, that included in Mansur's *The Treatment of H. Characters* (1940) as Appendix I (73-78). It was written with knowledge of Parry's work, but it does not address the nature and function of formulaic expression and so it differs fundamentally from the following analysis. It does, however, contain useful lists and statistics, with the following significant observations. Table 1, "Variety of Epithets", shows that Q. uses proportionally a much greater variety of epithets per hero than does H.: e.g. Achilles 66x with an epithet and with 32 different epithets, as opposed to 196x with an epithet in H. and with 36 different epithets. Table 2, "Favourite epithets", shows that frequent H. epithets are hardly ever applied to the same hero by Q. Table 3 lists all epithets applied by Q. to characters prominent in both H. and Q., and shows that a relatively small proportion[81] are applied by H. to the same characters. Table 4 gives totals of occurrences of heroic names in H. and Q. with and without epithets, showing that in H. 55 per cent of all occurrences are with an epithet, whilst in Q. the proportion is 37 per cent, but in Apollonius Rhodius only 10 per cent. In our commentary the use of epithets is noted under the following categories: context-specific uses, new applications, new meanings, new words, epithet subjects; for references see the index of subjects.

The only other work known to us on a related aspect of Q.'s language is that of E. Visser, *Homerische Versifikationstechnik* (1987). As a supplement to his analysis of the H. technique of constructing narrative statements of killing, and as a test case for his argument that this technique is necessarily a feature of oral composition, he compares Q.'s technique with equivalent statements[82]. He notes the following differences from H.: (1) Q. operates less in single-line units, i.e. he makes more use of enjambment[83]; (2) Q. is less economical in that he produces substantially more metrical doublets[84]; (3) epithets in Q. are not used as "context-neutral elements", but as Homerising embellishment. This last point, that epithets in the *PH*. are ornamental in one sense but not in another, is quite unconvincing, as is Visser's whole thesis, in explicit disagreement with Hoekstra's remarks[85], that the degree of difference observable between H. and

81 20 per cent according to Kakridis (208).
82 *Op. cit.* 266-89.
83 Cf. below in section H.
84 Cf. the following analysis.
85 *Op. cit.* 267-8

Q. corresponds with the difference between oral and written composition. That is a fundamental question to which we shall return.

It seemed to us that the simplest way of assessing the formulaic character of Q.'s language was to make a comparative analysis of a substantial sample of Parry's H. name-epithet combinations and their equivalents in the *PH*. We began by listing all single-word epithets applied by Q. to the names of heroines and heroes, excluding only patronymics. The total of such heroic epithets is 115, substantially greater than the total of 90 in H. listed by Parry. Given that the *PH.* is less than a third of the combined length of the *Iliad* and the *Odyssey*, this is a striking indication of the richness, or excess, of Q.'s adjectival usage[86]. Of Q.'s 115 epithets 26 are distinctive in the sense that they are confined to one heroic name, whilst 89 are generic in the sense that they are applied either to two or more heroic names or to one heroic name plus names of deities or nations and/or common nouns referring to persons. This is a considerably larger proportion of such generic epithets than is the case with H. usage, and it is a strong indication that Q.'s heroic epithets, like H.'s, function at least predominantly as an ornament, not with contextual significance.

In order to make meaningful comparison between individual systems of heroic names combined with epithets by H. and Q., it is necessary to choose names that occur with sufficient frequency in both cases. That severely restricts the number of suitable names, and there are very few more than the six that are analysed in the following order: Αἰνείας, Ἀγαμέμνων, Πρίαμος, Αἴας, i.e. the son of Telamon, Ἀχιλλεύς and Ὀδυσσεύς. Two numerical criteria are applied in all cases, which are arbitrary but useful: "significant repetition" means three or more times, and "frequent H. combination" means one used six or more times.

For **Αἰνείας** the totals of combinations, 10 in H. and 8 in Q., do not differ significantly, nor do the frequencies of individual combinations. None of Q.'s combinations is taken from H. The economy of both systems is unimpaired by any metrical doublets.

For **Ἀγαμέμνων** there *is* a significant difference between the totals of combinations, with nearly twice as many in H., 15 as opposed to 8. But more striking is the fact that all but one of the H. combinations are used with significant repetition, whilst that is true of only one combination in Q., the seemingly original ἐυμμελίης Ἀγαμέμνων noted by Hoekstra. Two out of Q.'s 8 combinations are H.—Ἀγαμέμνονα δῖον and Ἀτρείδῃ Ἀγαμέμνονι, the latter being a frequent H. combination. There are no metrical doublets in either system.

86 Cf. section F.

For **Πρίαμος** the difference between the totals of combinations is slightly greater than for Ἀγαμέμνων, with 17 in H. and 8 in Q. But between totals of those used with significant repetition the difference is less in this case, 7 in H. and 3 in Q. Two out of 8 combinations in Q. are H. — Δαρδανίδης Πρίαμος and Πριάμοιο ἄνακτος. All but one of Q.'s combinations are in the genitive case, and the economy of these is substantially impaired by two metrical doublets — Πριάμοιο ἄνακτος = Π. γέροντος and Πριάμοιο πολυτλήτοιο = Π. πολυχρύσοιο, whereas there are no doublets in the H. system.

For **Αἴας** Q. has a total of 20 combinations, the difference of which from the 25 in H. is relatively insignificant. In both cases relatively few are used with significant repetition, 6 in H. and 3 in Q. Just five out of Q.'s 20 combinations are H. — ἀρήιος...Αἴας (with modification), φαίδιμος Α. (a frequent H. combination), μέγαν Αἴαντα (with modification), Α. πελώριον and Αἴαντι δαΐφρονι. In this case there are actually more metrical doublets in the H. system — Αἴαντα ταχύν = Α. μέγαν and Αἴαντος Τελαμωνίου = Α. μεγαλήτορος — than in Q. — καρτερὸς Αἴας = φαίδιμος Α.

Both H. and Q. have by far the largest systems for **Ἀχιλλεύς**, the totals of 50 combinations in H. and 39 in Q. being in virtually the same ratio as for Αἴας. But again there is a greater disparity between the totals of those used with significant repetition, 13 in H. and 6 in Q. The proportion of Q.'s combinations taken from H., 8 out of 39, is similar to that in the last three cases: they are πτολίπορθος Ἀχιλλεύς (with modification), Αἰακίδην Ἀχιλῆα, Ἀ. δαΐφρονα, Ἀ. πελώριον, Ἀχιλῆος ἀμύμονος, ποδώκεος...Ἀ., Ἀχιλλῆος κρατεροῦ (with modification) and Ἀχιλῆι δαΐφρονι, not one of these being a frequent H. combination. A peculiarity of Q.'s system is the large proportion of combinations in the genitive case, with only one in the nominative. This time Q.'s system is markedly less economic than H.'s, in which there are only two metrical doublets — μεγάθυμος Ἀχιλλεύς = πόδας ὠκὺς Ἀ. and Ἀ. πελώριον = Ἀ. πόδας ταχύν — whilst in Q. there are as many as 7 — ἀμειλίκτου Ἀχιλῆος = ἀταρτηροῦ Ἀ., Ἀχιλῆος ἀμύμονος = Ἀ. ἀταρβέος, μενεπτολέμου Ἀ. = φιλοπτολέμου Ἀ., Ἀχιλλῆος θεοειδέος = Ἀ. κρατερόφρονος = Ἀ. μεγαλήτορος = Ἀ. μεγαλόφρονος, and κρατερῷ Ἀχιλῆι = μεγάλῳ Ἀ. This profusion of doublets in the genitive case is Q.'s most notable neglect of formulaic economy.

For the last heroic name, **Ὀδυσσεύς**, it seemed more helpful to compare the H. system in the *Iliad* alone. Essentially the same system obtains for the *Odyssey*, but obviously the totals of occurrences would be vastly disproportionate compared with both the the *Iliad* and the *PH*. The

total of combinations is actually greater in Q., 20 as opposed to 19 in the *Iliad*, the most surprising feature of Q.'s system being that there is only one combination in the nominative case. But when it comes to combinations used with significant repetition, there is a striking disparity, with 8 in H. and none at all in Q. Q.'s borrowings from H. in this case account for an even smaller proportion of his combinations than usual, two out of 20 — δῖος Ὀδυσσεύς (a frequent H. combination) and Ὀδυσῆα δαΐφρονα. Whilst the H. system is completely free of metrical doublets, there are 3 in Q. — Ὀδυσσεῦ φρένας αἰνέ = Ὀ. δολομῆτα, Ὀδυσσῆος πινυτόφρονος = Ὀ. πυκιμήδεος and Ὀδυσῆι δαΐφρονι = Ὀ. περίφρονι.

As a supplement to the foregoing analyses we have chosen the common noun that has the most elaborate epithet system in both H. and Q., νηῦς, which Parry also singled out for comparison. Whilst the difference between the totals of combinations, 48 in H. and 33 in Q., is not very striking, that between the totals of combinations used with significant repetition certainly is, with no fewer than 26 in H. but only one in Q. — νῆας Ἀχαιῶν, which is not strictly an epithet combination and is used just three times. The proportion of combinations adopted by Q. from H. is similar to that applying to most heroic names, 7 out of 33 — θοὴν ἐπὶ νῆα, θοῆς ἐκ νηός (with modification), νεὸς κυανοπρῴροιο, νηὶ μελαίνῃ, νῆας Ἀχαιῶν, θοὰς ἐπὶ νῆας and νηυσὶ θοῇσι. As with the systems for Ὀδυσσεύς, the economy of the H. system is not impaired by any metrical doublets, whereas in Q.'s system there are two — ἐυπρῴρους ἐπὶ νῆας = ἐυσκάρθμους ἐ. ν. and νηυσὶν ἐυπρῴροισι(ν) = ν. τανυπρῴροισιν.

In 5 out of these 7 examples Q.'s noun-epithet system is not greatly inferior to its H. counterpart in elaboration, i.e. in the number of different combinations. The H. systems differ from those of Q. most consistently in having a larger proportion of combinations used with significant repetition. Very much less marked is the superior economy, or efficiency, of the H. systems, i.e. their freedom from duplication, or doublets, because that freedom, as is well known, is by no means complete, and there are even exceptions to the rule, like the systems for Αἴας, where that of Q. is slightly more economical than the H. one. A very striking observation is that for all the general similarity of Q.'s systems to their H. counterparts, the proportion of combinations taken with little or no modification from H. is consistently small, never more than a quarter. This confirms the impression that although Q. is the most thoroughgoing Homeriser of all surviving poets, he is far from slavishly imitative. Indeed, his inventiveness is unfailingly impressive. A further point to be made about these noun-epithet systems, though not one to which attention has been drawn in the analyses, because it is a rather subjective matter, is that Q.'s epithets, no less than H.'s, are overwhelmingly ornamental and traditional, not

contextually significant, although there are undeniable exceptions to the rule, particularly with some combinations in the vocative case.

These conclusions amount to a total vindication of Hoekstra's observations on the relationship between the formulaic language of Q. and that of H., and also, as a corollary, to a disproof of Visser's conclusion that there is a difference between the two attributable only to the difference between written and oral composition. The difference in formulaic usage is essentially one of degree, esp. as regards the average length of formulae and their frequency. The difference most plausibly attributable to the use of writing is Q.'s complete avoidance of large-scale repetition, either in typical scenes or in repeated messages, but even that would not necessarily be explained thus if it were found in an epic of the Archaic period. According to Hoekstra, application of Parry's arguments to the language of Q. "would necessarily lead to the conclusion that this poem was an oral composition". If by oral composition we mean composition without the aid of writing, oral composition of the *PH.* in the third century A.D. is completely excluded. That being the case, it is surely an inescapable conclusion that the formulaic language of the H. epics is fully compatible with composition aided by writing. Many scholars have argued for this conclusion, but we believe that the present comparison proves it more decisively than any others.[87]

H - METRE

There are two detailed and systematic studies of the metre of the *PH.*, that of Koechly in his 1850 edition, *proleg.* xxxii-xlviii, which is only partly superseded by the second one, Vian, *Recherches*, ch. 7 (212-49). Keydell[88] gives a brief summary of the main features. Q.'s metrical practice is broadly consistent with his language in that it is remarkable for its closeness to that of H. For one thing he is not one of those later epic poets who show the influence of Callimachus' metrical reforms. The two most prominent features of his practice that differ from H.'s are his preference for feminine (trochaic) caesura over masculine in the third foot, which he shares with most late epic poets, and a much greater preponderance of dactylic over spondaic feet, which produces an unparalleled frequency of wholly dactylic lines[89]. The following simply calls attention to those metrical features treated in the commentary.

With hiatus Q. largely follows H. practice: see 44n., 163n., 169n., 194n., 399n. The same is true of the related matter of observance and

87 For a recent review of the matter, which rejects written composition of the H. epics in favour of oral dictation, see R. Janko, "The Homeric Poems as Oral Dictated Texts", *CQ* 48 (1998) 1-13.

88 *RE* 1295.

89 Details are given by G.E. Duckworth, "Five Centuries of Latin Hexameter Poetry, Appendix: A Note on Repetition in Q.S.", *TAPA* 98 (1967) 139-41.

neglect of initial digamma in words like ἔργον (44n.) and the dative pronoun οἱ (399n.), the choice being determined by metrical convenience. One licence that is very much more restricted with Q. than with H. is the purely metrical lengthening of syllables that are properly short. The only noteworthy cases of this in book 5 are ἔσαν 113 and ἔμεν 524 with the second syllable counted as long in the *princeps* although followed by a vowel. The former contradicts M. L. West's rule[90] that Q. allows this only at the caesura and with punctuation. Q.'s most important departure from H. prosody is his frequent use of so-called Attic correption, syllables ending in mute and liquid consonants counted as short: see 22n., 247n., 374n., 521n. One licence that is relatively rare in H., feminine (trochaic) caesura in the fourth foot, is no less so in Q. As Vian[91] notes, very few cases in the *PH.* amount to serious infractions of the rule, the only such in book 5 being at 152 (=4.287).

Finally, Visser's observation, recorded above in section G, that Q. makes more use than H. of enjambment, the running over of sense units from one line to the next, calls for closer examination. Comparison in this matter is best focused upon what is termed necessary enjambment, where sense is genuinely incomplete at the line end. Statistics for the occurrence of such enjambment in early Greek and in Hellenistic epic are provided by R. Janko[92]: 26-30 per cent of lines in early epic, 35 per cent in Callimachus and 45-49 per cent in Apollonius. Our analysis of 5.1-600 of the *PH.* indicates 38.7 per cent of lines with necessary enjambment. N. Hopkinson[93] observes that Q. avoids too much end-stopping (correspondence of sense and line ends) by often having a sense pause after the first word of a line, which, however, is hardly less a feature of the H. epics. Our sample of the *PH.*, 5.1-600, contains 44 occurrences of sense pause after the first word of a line, and with 42 of these appropriate emphasis is conveyed. Weak enjambment of a single word is distinctly the exception to the rule, but emphatic enjambment of two or more words is not uncommon.

---

90 *Greek Metre* (1982), 179.
91 *Op. cit.* 242-3.
92 *Homer, Hesiod and the Hymns* (1982), 30-33.
93 *Greek Poetry of the Imperial Period* (1994), 106.

COMMENTARY

1-120: The Arms of Achilles

Book 5 narrates the adjudging of the armour of Achilles to Odysseus in preference to Ajax and the consequent madness and suicide of Ajax. The offer of the armour by Thetis as a reward for rescuing the body of Achilles marks the conclusion of the funeral games in his honour, which occupy book 4. The offer is introduced with a description of the armour (3-120), most of which (6-101) details the scenes on the shield. These are modelled substantially on the corresponding description of Achilles' shield in the *Iliad* (Σ 478-607).

In order to present Q.'s work in proper perspective we shall first summarise the H. model and his own version and then outline the tradition in Greek and Latin poetry of ecphrasis, description of works of art, with emphasis on features that are most relevant to Q.'s employment of it. In the case of H. we shall briefly consider the widest scope of ecphrasis, but thereafter we shall limit consideration to descriptions of pictorial representations, especially, though not exclusively, those of scenes on shields.

The standard work on the subject is still P. Friedländer, *Johannes von Gaza und Paulus Silentiarius* (Leipzig 1912), 1-103. See also J.A.W. Heffernan, *Museum of Words. The Poetics of Ekphrasis from Homer to Ashbery* (Chicago 1994) and A.S. Becker, *The Shield of Achilles and the Poetics of Ekphrasis* (Maryland and London 1995). On the works discussed below the following commentaries may be consulted: *Iliad* 18, M.W. Edwards, *The Iliad: a Commentary*, ed. G.S. Kirk, vol. V (Cambridge 1991); pseudo-Hesiod, *Scutum*, C.F. Russo (Florence 1950 & 1965); Aeschylus, *Septem*, G.O. Hutchinson (Oxford 1985); Euripides, *Phoenissae*, D.J. Mastronarde (Cambridge 1994); Euripides, *Electra*, J.D. Denniston (Oxford 1939) & M.J. Cropp (Warminster 1988); Apollonius, *Argonautica* 1, F. Vian & E. Delage (Paris 1974); Theocritus 2, A.S.F. Gow (Cambridge 1950 & 1952); Moschus, *Europa*, W. Bühler (Wiesbaden 1960); Catullus 64, C.J. Fordyce (Oxford 1961 & 1973); Virgil, *Aeneid* 1, R.G. Austin (Oxford 1971); *Aeneid* 8, K.W. Gransden (Cambridge 1976); Nonnus, *Dionysiaca* 25, F. Vian (Paris 1990). Useful articles include: D.P. Fowler, "Narrate and Describe: the Problem of Ekphrasis", *JRS* 81 (1991) 25-35; A. Laird, "Sounding out Ecphrasis: Art and Text in Catullus 64", *JRS* 83 (1993) 18-30; R.F. Thomas, "Virgil's Ecphrastic Centerpieces", *HSCP* 87 (1983) 175-84; D.W.T.C. Vessey, "Silius Italicus' The Shield of Hannibal", *AJP* 96 (1975) 391-405; R.D. Williams, "The Shield of Aeneas", *Vergilius* 27 (1981) 8-11.

The H. description begins with a statement of the shield's structure (Σ 478-82) that presents the work of Hephaestus as an ongoing process. This is

maintained by the recurrent use of verbs of making in the active voice to introduce the following scenes. Most later examples of ecphrasis, including Q.'s, do not adopt this feature, but present the work as already complete in accordance with the different requirements of the narrative. But this difference of presentation does not affect the manner in which the scenes are described. After the introduction H. describes ten scenes (thirteen with subdivision) at greatly varied length (minimum two lines, maximum 32 lines) over 125 lines (483-607): earth, sky, sea and celestial bodies (483-9); a city at peace, with wedding and trial (490-508); a city at war, with siege, ambush and battle (509-40); ploughing (541-9); reaping (550-60); vintage (561-72); cattle, with lions killing a bull (573-86); sheep (587-9); dancing (590-605); Ocean round the rim (606-7). The passage concludes with five lines (608-12) recording the manufacture of corslet, helmet and greaves. There is no obvious thematic link between any of the scenes and the narrative context. In at least two cases description is developed into narrative that exceeds the limits of visual representation, viz. the trial and the ambush and battle.

In Q.'s version the introductory statement (3-5), unlike H.'s, does not indicate the shield's structure. Q. presents nine scenes, fourteen with subdivision, but they are less varied in length than H.'s (minimum five lines, maximum eighteen) and on a slightly smaller scale, with a total of 96 lines. Scene 1 (6-16) is in three parts: (A) sky, upper air and celestial bodies (6-10); (B) lower air and birds (11-13); (C) sea, ocean and rivers (14-16). Of these only (A) has a H. counterpart, being based loosely on Σ 483-9. Scene 2, wild animals and hunters (17-24), has some thematic similarity to Σ 573-86, but is not obviously based on it. Scene 3, slaughter in battle with associated personifications and monsters (25-42), corresponds with part of H.'s city at war, but is closely similar only to Σ 535-8, which is probably an interpolation from the pseudo-Hesiodic *Scutum* (156-9). At 43-44 Q. introduces an emphatic break between the two preceding scenes of war and the five following ones of peace, thereby extending and making explicit the H. contrast between the two cities. The two parts of scene 4, the prosperity of just cities (45-48) and the mountain of Arete (49-56), draw from other sources and owe nothing to the H. city at peace beyond its function as a counterpart to warfare. A thematic link with the narrative, which may be original, will be considered in the introduction to this scene. Scene 5, reaping and ploughing (57-65), runs together what are two separate scenes in H. and contains some close verbal reflection of them. The first part of scene 6, music and dancing (66-68), closely reflects the wedding in H.'s city at peace, whilst the second part, Aphrodite anadyomene (69-72), is a complete innovation designed to provide a natural link with the next scene. Scene 7, the wedding of Peleus and Thetis (73-79), is also an innovation and is the only one of Q.'s scenes that has an obvious thematic link with the narrative. The two parts of scene 8, ships on a stormy sea (80-87) and Poseidon calming the sea and greeted by dolphins (88-96), are another thematic innovation, possibly conceived as a counterpart to the contrast between war and peace. Q.'s description, like H.'s, concludes with Ocean running round the

rim of the shield (99-101 ~ Σ 606-7), but in Q.'s case this is preceded by the innovative statement that there were many other scenes on the shield (97-98). Cf. the analysis of the scenes on the shield by C.S. Byre, "Per aspera (et arborem) ad astra: Ramifications of the Allegory of Arete in Quintus Smyrnaeus *Posthomerica* 5.49-68," *Hermes* 110 (1982) 184-95. The rest of Achilles' armour is described at much greater length by Q. than by H., whose brief description is replaced first by eight lines (102-9) describing the helmet adorned with a Titanomachy and then by eleven lines (110-20) on the corslet, greaves, sword and spear. Clearly Q. felt that the disproportionate attention to the shield in H. needed to be redressed to some extent. A final point about Q.'s ecphrasis is that the H. tendency, noted above, to develop description beyond the limits of what could be represented visually is not apparent.

It should be emphasised that the foregoing analysis is confined to the relationship between Q. and his H. model. Other cases of influence or imitation will be noted either in the introductions to individual scenes or in the line-by-line commentary.

The H. ecphrasis of the shield of Achilles may be regarded as an extreme development of the varied descriptive elaboration that accompanies the typical scenes of arming in the *Iliad*, of which the longest is that of Agamemnon at Λ 16-44 (cf. Paris Γ 328-39, Patroclus Π 130-44, Achilles T 368-91). There both corslet and shield-strap are adorned with snakes, and the shield with a Gorgon and two associated personifications. Similarly the aegis, or shield, of Athena, described as part (E 738-42) of an abnormal arming scene (E 733-47), has a Gorgon's head and four personifications. In the *Odyssey* the baldric of Heracles depicts wild animals and battles (λ 609-14). In these and other cases where artefacts are described in some detail by H. (e.g. the cup of Nestor Λ 632-7 and the palace and garden of Alcinous η 86-131) attention is focused upon the object for its own sake, seemingly without any attempt made to link it with the narrative. In one case, however, such a link is of the greatest significance, namely Helen's weaving of scenes from the war that is being fought on her own account (Γ 125-8).

The earliest extant post-H. example of ecphrasis is the pseudo-Hesiodic description of the shield of Heracles (*Scut.* 139-317), which marks the climax of the hero's arming (122ff.). Both its thematic relationship to the H. shield and its considerably larger scale suggest rivalry as an authorial motive. Also it set a precedent for ecphrasis as a large part of a relatively small-scale narrative. The first and larger part of it (139-237) contains ten scenes that are all original in relation to the H. model and mostly concerned with conflict. In this way the poet places the main emphasis on direct reflection of the narrative context, possibly influenced by the brief H. descriptions of the shields of Agamemnon and Athena. But imitation of the shield of Achilles is shown in the latter part of the ecphrasis by the division of most of it between a city at war (237-70) and a city at peace (270-313), which has seven scenes, four based substantially on H. counterparts, viz. wedding

(272-86 ~ Σ 491-6), ploughing (286-8 ~ Σ 541-9), reaping (288-91 ~ Σ 550-60) and vintage (292-301 ~ Σ 561-72). To the H. conclusion with Ocean round the rim (314-5 ~ Σ 606-7) is added the novel touch of swans swimming on the same (315-7, cf. Euripides, *Phaethon* 77-8), which functions as a thematic link with the narrative through a kind of word-play that is not uncommon in early Greek epic, Cycnus, 'Swan', being the name of Heracles' adversary. One other such link is contrived through the identification of the city at peace with Heracles' native Thebes (271-2). Apart from points of detail the influence of the pseudo-Hesiodic ecphrasis on Q. was clearly important in that it provided an example of imitation of the H. model combined with a large proportion of thematic innovation.

Poetic ecphrasis is found next in tragedy with Aeschylus' series of briefly reported descriptions of the devices on the shields of the seven leaders attacking Thebes (between *Septem* 387 and 649). These descriptions differ from early epic examples in their consistent use to reflect the character of the bearer, a function that is less prominent in Euripides' imitation (*Phoenissae* 1107-38).The most important of Euripides' ecphrases for our purposes is his description of the arms of Achilles in the first stasimon of *Electra* (442-78). It exhibits another mix of imitation and innovation, this time mostly innovation, in relation to H. One difference is that these are the original arms brought to Achilles on Mount Pelion. Then the description has both H. and pseudo-Hesiodic elements, resp. celestial bodies in the centre (~ Σ 483-9) and Perseus carrying the Gorgon's head round the rim (~ *Scut.* 216-37). Also apparently novel are sphinxes on the helmet, Chimaera and Pegasus on the corslet and horses on the sword (? or spear). Some of the images can be seen to reflect motifs in the play as a whole.

Three Hellenistic poets have one noteworthy example of ecphrasis apiece. Apollonius describes seven miscellaneous scenes on the cloak of Jason (1.730-67) at fairly uniform length, of which the last, Phrixus listening to the golden-fleeced ram, provides an obvious reference to the narrative. Theocritus' example of ecphrasis (1.27-56), the bowl offered to Thyrsis in return for the song of Daphnis, has three scenes of which the contextual relevance is problematic. Moschus, on the other hand, provides the first example of a sustained thematic link in the three scenes described on the basket of Europa (2.44-62), for all are from the story of Io and all are relevant to the fate of her descendant Europa.

Hellenistic inspiration is generally assumed to have been important for the first example of ecphrasis in Latin poetry, which is also the longest in either language. More than half of Catullus' poem on the marriage of Peleus and Thetis is devoted to the scene on the coverlet on the bridal bed, viz. the desertion of Ariadne by Theseus and her rescue by Dionysus (64.50-266). But the actual description, in two separated parts (50-75 and 249-66), is relatively brief and forms a frame for two related stories, Theseus' visit to Crete and the death of his father, which themselves frame a dramatic passage including a long speech by Ariadne. This is an extreme example of ecphrasis that departs completely from visual representation. The description proper

provides a loose connection with the main narrative by presenting the prospect of marriage between a mortal and an immortal.

Virgil's use of ecphrasis in the *Aeneid* is remarkable chiefly for the subtlety with which description and narrative are connected, especially in the two most elaborate examples. The seven scenes of the Trojan war (*Aen.* 1.466-93) viewed by Aeneas on the temple of Juno at Carthage, which include one depicting Aeneas himself (488-9), are all described briefly, but are introduced with a dramatic passage (456-65) in which Aeneas expresses his emotional reaction. The H. inspiration for this involves a different art form, viz. Demodocus' moving account of two Trojan episodes featuring Odysseus that cause Odysseus to weep (θ 62-95 and 492-534). The shield made by Vulcan for Aeneas (8.626-728) is described on approximately the same scale as Q.'s shield of Achilles. But whereas the first eight scenes, taken from Roman legend and history, are all described quite briefly, climactic elaboration is given to the final pair, the battle of Actium and the triumph of Augustus, which occupies more than half the passage (671-728). The description itself is framed by Aeneas' reaction. His admiration for what he sees is stated (617-9) and is then ironically contrasted with his failure to comprehend its connection with his own historic destiny (729-31).

Notable examples of poetic ecphrasis are found in the two longest surviving Latin and Greek epics, the one earlier than Q., the *Punica* of Silius Italicus, and the other later, the *Dionysiaca* of Nonnus. Silius' description of the shield presented to Hannibal (2.406-50), part of the armour made for him by the Galicians, is on a more modest scale than that of Aeneas' shield, by which it is obviously inspired. The wider influence of the *Aeneid* is clear in the first four scenes, which are taken from it. These and the remaining six scenes depict the legends and history of Carthage and so have a general connection with the narrative. Nonnus describes at some length the necklace that was the wedding present of Harmonia wife of Cadmus (5.144-89) as well as the weaving of a different Harmonia, the celestial Allmother (41.294-302), which may have been suggested by the weaving of Helen in the *Iliad* (Γ 125-8). The woven scene is cosmic, with earth, sky, sea, rivers and Ocean, and it has broad similarity to both Σ 483-9 and Q. 5.6-16. The possibility of influence from Q. applies both to this scene and to the central cosmic scene depicted on the shield made by Hephaestus and given to Dionysus by Rhea (25.387-562), Nonnus' most elaborate example of ecphrasis. The scale of this is the same as that of the pseudo-Hesiodic shield description, but in marked contrast to the latter it contains only five scenes, the fourth being disproportionately long (102 lines, 451-552). This is a substantial narrative of the killing and resuscitation of Tylus, and it is the most remarkable case, after that in Catullus 64, of ecphrasis exceeding the limits of visual representation.

Finally we turn to Q.'s own further use of ecphrasis, and the two relevant passages will be taken in reverse order. At 10.180-205 the baldric and quiver of Philoctetes, which previously belonged to Heracles, are described. The description of the wild animals and battles on the baldric (180-7) is simply a

more elaborate version of the H. description of the same object (~ λ 609-14), so that it amounts to both a link with the narrative and an indication of the author's indebtedness, much like Silius' use of scenes from the *Aeneid*. Q.'s description of the shield of Eurypylus (6.198-293) is on exactly the same scale as that of the shield of Achilles, but the inclusion of no fewer than eighteen scenes, all of them labours of Heracles and all on a similar scale, has a rather monotonous effect from which the other description is free. Another difference is that here there is an overall link with the narrative in that Heracles was the grandfather of Eurypylus (son of Telephus). This description concludes with two lines (292-3) stating that many other deeds of Heracles were depicted on the shield, which is essentially the same point as that made by two lines almost at the end of the earlier ecphrasis (5.97-98). Comparison gives the impression of a distinctive authorial trademark. Campbell (on 12.144) notes this as a habit of Q.'s. In conclusion it is worth noting an instance of what amounts to self-reference on Q.'s part. At 7.194-203 Odysseus briefly describes the armour of Achilles to Neoptolemus, indicating the contents of the scenes on the shield as earth, sky, sea and animals.

1-3

The narrative continues from the end of book 4 without a break. 3 **θῆκεν...Θέτις** echoes the opening of the games 4.115-6 τοῖσι δ' ἄμ' ἀγρομένοισι Θέτις κυανοκρήδεμνος / θῆκεν ἄεθλα, as well as the one H. reference to the present episode λ 544-7.

1 **ἀλλ' ὅτε...ἄεθλοι** Later, at the resumption of the main narrative, Thetis says νῦν μὲν δὴ...ἀέθλια πάντα τελέσθη (123), where πάντα indicates that the award of the armour is separate from the contests of the funeral games. That would be inconsistent with πολλοὶ in the present passage if taken to mean 'most of' (= οἱ πολλοί), and the same objection would apply to the emendation ῥ' ἄλλοι, 'the rest of'. But there is no inconsistency if πολλοὶ ἄεθλοι means 'the contests which were many' (πολλοὶ = πολλοὶ ὄντες). ἀπανύω is a H. *hapax* (η 326), which Q. may have consciously revived (cf. 9.1). A possible model for verbal form and context is *Scut.* 310-1 οὐδέ ποτέ σφιν / νίκη ἐπηνύσθη, ἀλλ' ἄκριτον εἶχον ἄεθλον.

2 **'Αχιλλῆος μεγαλήτορος** = 3.739. The adj. is very frequent in H., but is used by Q. only 5x.

2 **ἄμβροτα τεύχη/** = 2.466, 12.174, ~ 12.303, 5.126, 319, the adj. being consistently applied to armour that is either made or worn by gods. The form τεύχη is frequent in Q. (22x), always at the line end; in H. only Η 207, Χ 322, τεύχεα being the usual form.

3 **θεὰ Θέτις** in the *Iliad* is usually (7x) followed by ἀργυρόπεζα, which would fill the line here. Q. avoids the formula and emphasises the name and role of the goddess by ending the sentence at the diaeresis. Q.

mostly prefers the early-epic nom. and voc. form θεά (cf. esp. 638) to θεή, but is not consistent (see Vian on 563).

3-5

In introducing the shield Q. seems consciously to delay explicit mention of it till **ἀμφὶ σάκος** 5. There is a highlighting contrast between the importance of the noun and its syntactical subordination.

With **δαίδαλα** 4, even before mention of the shield, Q. hints at recollection of the H. description of the same, which is introduced with both δαιδάλλων and δαίδαλα (Σ 479, 482). For its combination with μαρμαίρω cf. the opening of Moschus' ecphrasis, 2.43 ἐν τῷ δαίδαλα πολλὰ τετεύχατο μαρμαίροντα. The verb, which occurs in early epic only in the present participle, is used by Q. with notable frequency (26x), 6x in the frequentative imperf. as here; cf. esp. 2.206-7.

Q. is fond of the H. periphrasis with **σθένος** 4 plus gen. of personal name (21x).

Aor. **ποίησε** 5 in the relative clause has the force of English pluperf. 'had made', referring to the earlier construction of the shield. The verbs that have the same reference in the following description are either pluperf. pass. or intransitive imperf., e.g. ἤσκητο 6, τέτυκτο 9, κεῖτο 7, πέλοντο 19. The H. description, as mentioned above, records the work in progress with active verbs throughout (e.g. ποίει Σ 478, ἔτευξ' Σ 483). In this matter Q. follows the practice of the pseudo-Hesiodic description (e.g. τέτυκτο *Scut.* 154, ἔσαν 161).

5 θρασύφρονος Αἰακίδαο/ = 7.689, ~ 1.766, 7.708. This is a variant of the common H. line end ποδώκεος Αἰακίδαο (9x), which Q. avoids. θρασύφρων, possibly coined by Oppian (*Hal.* 1.112), is favoured by Q. (15x) as an alternative for H. δαΐφρων and κρατερόφρων. As a closure we have emphatic naming of Achilles that echoes 'Αχ. μεγ. 2 with typical epic variation.

6-16

The scenes on the shield are presented initially as a representation of the universe, "une mappemonde en relief", as Vian puts it (II 5): 6-10 sky and celestial bodies, 11-13 air and birds, 14-16 sea, Ocean and rivers. This both reflects and departs pointedly from the opening of the H. description Σ 483-9, which begins with a bald listing of earth, sky, sea, sun, moon and stars, names four constellations and elaborates on the last, the Great Bear, with only incidental mention of Ocean. Q.'s inclusion of Ocean here for the sake of cosmological completeness leads to a duplication when he follows H. in concluding the shield description with Ocean (99-101), as is noted by Kakridis (53). In H. there is no explicit link between this and the following scenes, although they are obviously located on the earth, as is noted in a prose paraphrase of the H. description that is probably near in time to Q. (Philostratus the Younger, *Imagines* 10.5 and 7). The H. scenes also lack any explicit indication of their arrangement on the shield, apart from the final statement that Ocean runs round its rim (Σ 606-7). The same is true of

the pseudo-Hesiodic description, apart from one indication that the series begins at the centre (*Scut.* 144).

Q. is no more explicit about either the arrangement of his scenes or their relationship to the present passage, leaving unstated the obvious fact that they are all located on land or sea. Cf. R.F. Newbold, "Space and Scenery in Quintus of Smyrna, Claudian and Nonnus," *Ramus* 10 (1981) 53-68 and Keydell, *R.E.* 1280. Within the present passage, however, minimal indications of spatial arrangement, such as are lacking in the H. model, are provided as follows: πρῶτα (preferable to the variant καὶ τὰ) μὲν...οὐρανὸς ἠδ' αἰθήρ (6-7), τῶν δ' ἄρ' ...ὑπένερθεν...ἀήρ (11), Τηθὺς δ' ἀμφετέτυκτο...(14). Vian (II 5 n.4) plausibly takes this to imply a convex shield lying flat on its rim so that its centre is its peak, corresponding naturally with the position of the sky. Placement of the sea and Ocean round the rim, implied by ἀμφετέτυκτο, is confirmed at the end of the descriptions (99-101). But in the rest of the arrangement there are two weaknesses. Firstly οὐρανὸς ἠδ' αἰθήρ are contrasted with earth and sea and said to contain winds and clouds as well as the celestial bodies (6-10). This implies that αἰθήρ, in accordance with early epic usage, means air in general, including the region of meteorological phenomena. Then, however, ἀήρ, described as the home of birds, is spoken of as a lower region (11-13). This reflects the post-H. distinction between αἰθήρ as upper air and ἀήρ as lower air. Vian (II xv) suggests a plausible explanation of this seeming confusion, viz. that Q. frequently mentions winds and clouds as well as αἰθήρ in connection with the location and locomotion of divine beings. The second weakness is that in the third cosmic division (14-16) the location of earth is simply alluded to incidentally by διὰ γαίης at the end. This relegation is the more surprising because already at 7 earth and sea were mentioned as counterparts of sky and air.

6 ἤσκητο ἀσκέω is used by Q. only in the perf. and pluperf. pass. meaning 'be produced as a work of art'; for its tense see 5n. **6 θεοκμήτῳ ἐπὶ ἔργῳ/** = 49, where the variant θεοδμήτῳ reflects the fact that θεόκμητος is a synonym, possibly coined by Q., of H. θεόδμητος 'made' or 'built by a god'; cf. 3.419, 12.514. -κμητος from κάμνω in its transitive meaning 'make', 'build' was a well-established equivalent of -δμητος from δέμω 'build' (cf. H. ἀνδρόκμητος, πολύκμητος), which Q. uses in H. εὔδμητος. But -δμητος may also be derived from δαμάω 'subdue', as in νεόδμητος, which Q. uses and from which he differentiates νεόκμητος 'newly built'. This may provide a clue to his thinking in coining θεόκμητος.

7 γαίῃ δ' ἅμα κεῖτο θάλασσα is best taken as a logically subordinated contrast in the paratactic epic manner, so that 8-10 follow smoothly with the contents of οὐρανός and αἰθήρ. It foreshadows the third region described at 14-16.

8 ἐν δ' Q. uses adv. ἐν 13x to introduce successive elements in his description of the shield, and in this he follows his H. and pseudo-Hesiodic models, which use ἐν similarly throughout, except that the latter introduces its last element with prepos. ἀμφί. That could have influenced Q. in his choice of adv. ἀμφί as a frequent alternative for ἐν in this description, where ἀμφί denotes nothing more precise than spatial proximity. An exact precedent for Q.'s usage was provided by Moschus' two uses of adv. ἐν followed by adv. ἀμφί (2.44, 50, 55). For similar *variatio* in ecphrasis cf. A.R. 1.721-68. In Q.'s own other examples of ecphrasis (6.198-293, 10.180-205) the introductory expressions are slightly more varied.
9 κεκριμέν' ἄλλυδις ἄλλα, 'all in their separate places' (Combellack). ἄλλυδις plus a form of ἄλλος is a distinctively H. type of expression (13x), used occasionally by later epic poets, frequently by Q. (17x). As an equivalent to ἄλλοσε, ἄλλυδις is used properly with expressions of motion, as in all H. examples and in all but two of Q.'s, 1.379 and the present case, although κεκριμένα could be taken to imply motion.
9-10 τέτυκτο δὲ.../...οὐρανὸν ἀμφιφέρονται Cf. Σ 485 ἐν δὲ τὰ τείρεα πάντα τά τ' οὐρανὸς ἐστεφάνωται, and an even more precise precedent A.R. 4.261 οὔπω τείρεα πάντα τά τ' οὐρανῷ εἱλίσσονται. On syntactical grounds δινήεντα, 'whirling', 'revolving', can be taken with either ὁππόσα or οὐρανόν, though with ὁππόσα it would be redundant as duplicating the meaning of ἀμφιφέρονται. A precise precedent for its application to οὐρανόν is Callimachus frag. 498 (Pfeiffer), if the slightly emended δινήεντ' Ἀκμονίδην is accepted, where the patronymic 'Α. is a learned substitute for οὐρανόν .
11 τῶν δ' ἄρ' ὁμῶς ὑπένερθεν is the reading of all MSS., but Spitzner and Koechly emend τῶν resp. to τοῖς and τῷ governed by ὁμῶς. Q. uses ὁμῶς frequently both with dat. and as adv.; for close parallels to its adv. use here cf. 3.714, 11.70, 375. He uses ὑπένερθε as adv. 5x and with preceding gen. at 643. For separation of ὑπ. from its gen. cf. 6.581. The positive objection to τοῖς or τῷ is that ὁμῶς must then be taken in the precise sense of 'equally', which is not appropriate to the context. As adv. it is naturally understood as 'likewise', 'also'.
11 ἀπειρέσιος, 'boundless', 'countless', is an adj. somewhat overworked by Q. (65x). In many of its applications (approx. 30x), as to θαῦμα at 40, it rather vaguely denotes extremity, intensity.
11 κέχυτ' ἀήρ in form and meaning reflects H. κέχυτ' ἀχλύς (3x), the two nouns being synonyms in H., though here ἀήρ means 'lower air' (see 6-16n.). In this case use of the passive verb (cf. ἤσκητο 6) does not refer to the completed production of the shield, for that would require it to be taken in the rare sense of 'smelt' or 'cast' (see LSJ χέω I.3).

12 τανυχειλέες, 'long-beaked', may have been coined by Q., but it has an impeccable H. pedigree: cf. H. τανύγλωσσος, τανυπτέρυξ, τανυσίπτερος as well as ἀγκυλοχείλης, epithet of vultures and eagles.

12 ἀμφεποτῶντο/ echoes with variation ἀμφιφέρονται/ 10. Imperf. is used throughout the present description for action imagined to be in progress (e.g. ἐξεχέοντο 15) and it is a normal feature of Greek epic ecphrasis.

13 φαίης...φέρεσθαι is the first of eight explicit comments by Q. on the lifelikeness of the scenes (cf. 24, 28, 42, 68, 84, 90, 96), a feature of epic ecphrasis, though by no means always as frequent as here. H. has only two examples (Σ 539, 548-9), but pseudo-Hesiod nine (*Scut.* 189, 194 etc.), whilst Apollonius has four (1.739 etc.) and Moschus one (2.47). Q. himself has nine examples in his other comparable descriptions (6.201 etc. and 10.185 etc.).

Similar to **ζώοντας 13** is the frequent use of a form of ζωός (Σ 539, *Scut.* 189, 194, 244), notably by Q. himself (42, 68, 10.185). The other expression most prominent in Q.'s comments is ὡς ἐτεόν (περ) (24, 84, 90, 6.221, 280, 10.194), for which the only precedent is A.R. 1.763. Unique among such comments is the use here of **φαίης κε** plus inf., which, together with negative οὐδέ κε φαίης, is H. (6x) and cultivated by Q. (9x). A precise precedent in ecphrasis is Theocritus' use of the expression in the same *sedes* (1.42). Nonnus has τάχα φαίης in ecphrasis (*Dion.* 25.421). In Virgil's Shield of Aeneas *credas* plus inf. (*Aen.* 8.691, cf. Silius, *Pun.* 2.430) is similar.

Association of **Τηθύς 14** with Ὠκεανός reflects both early mythology (e.g. Ξ 200-210, Hesiod *Th.* 337ff.) and later poetic use of T. as a common noun for 'sea' (see LSJ s.v. II), which applies to all but one (398) of Q.'s own five other uses of it.

14 ἀμφετέτυκτο appears to be a compound coined by Q., who has an extraordinary number of verbs in ἀμφι-, about forty, doubtless because he regarded them as distinctively epic.

14 Ὠκεανοῦ βαθὺ χεῦμα/ Cf. H. line ends βαθυρρόου Ὠκεανοῖο (4x), ῥόον (-ς) Ὠκεανοῖο (4x). For similar uses of χεῦμα by Q. cf. Ὠκεανοῦ πλατὺ χ. 8.463 and Ὠκεανοῖο κατὰ πλ. χ. 7.303.

As Koechly and Vian (II 5 n.7) note, the notion of rivers flowing out of the stream of Ocean (15) was a familiar feature of primitive Greek cosmology (cf. e.g. Φ 195-7), whereas Τηθύς meaning 'sea' should entail the opposite.

The mainly epic adv. **ἄφαρ 15**, 'immediately', 'suddenly', can mean 'swiftly'. This sense, as here, with an imperf. verb is unusual, but cf. e.g. 4.401-4.

Vian (*Rech.* 155) defends **ποταμῶν ἀλεγεινῶν 15** by comparison with 7.118 and 10.144-5. But those passages refer resp. to a river in flood and a particular named river, and as an epithet of rivers in general

ἀλεγεινός, 'painful', 'harmful', remains surprising. Also, a learned reference to the use of the adj. at P 749 and to the interpretation of it recorded by Eustathius (1126.6), as suggested by Vian, hardly accords with Q.'s manner. Rhodomann's emendation κελαδεινῶν, 'sounding', (cf. ποταμῷ κελάδοντι 10.171) is helped by the possibility of corruption from ἀλεγειναί/ 18.

16 κυκλόθεν The form seems to have been confined to prose before Q.; later it is used by Nonnus (*Dion.* 36.325). It is used here as an equivalent to adv. κύκλῳ that avoids hiatus, doubtless on the analogy of ἔνδοθεν. 16 ἄλλυδις ἄλλη, the reading of all MSS., is emended to **ἄ. ἄλλῃ** by Zimmermann, followed by Vian and Pompella. For the type of expression see 9n. Adv. ἄλλῃ is synonymous with ἄλλυδις; for their use in combination cf. 11.471, 14.533. ἄλλη here would imply sing. ῥοή in apposition to ῥοαί, but that involves taking ἄλλυδις with ἐξεχέοντο, so that ἑλισσομένων must at the same time be separated from κυκλόθεν ἄ. ἄ. and refer back to ποταμῶν. κυκλόθεν, however, goes much more naturally with ἑλισσομένων, "winding their circling courses" (Combellack). Therefore read ἄλλῃ.

17-24

Scene 2, wild animals and hunters. Five lines (17-21) are devoted to the animals, divided equally between first the barely listed lions, jackals, bears and leopards, and secondly, as a climax to the list, boars described as whetting their tusks. Then in three lines (22-24) the hunters are divided between those who drive dogs from behind and those who throw stones and javelins in front. The description is developed so as to leave the impression of an encounter between hunters and boars alone. As noted above (on 1-120), there is some thematic connection with Σ 573-86, the herd of cattle accompanied by herdsmen and dogs, and the killing of a bull by two lions, which the dogs vainly attempt to deter. But Q.'s scene is almost completely different in detail, and the same is true of its relationship to the two comparable scenes on the pseudo-Hesiodic shield, the fight between boars and lions (168-177) and the hunting of hares with dogs (302-4). Q. is evidently working under the influence of the H. boar-hunt simile in which men and dogs attack while the boar whets its tusk(s), Λ 414-8. That is recalled again by Q. 9.240-4, in a simile which resembles the present passage for its association of the boar with jackals and a lion.

One H. precedent for the association of hunting with warfare (25-42) is the brief description of the baldric of Heracles (λ 609-12) with its wild beasts and battles, as noted by Vian (II 203 n.5). At least as important is the regular use of hunting similes in the battle narratives of the *Iliad*, which Q. himself adopts. Also relevant is the traditional representation of hunting as a form of warfare (e.g. Xenophon, *Cyro.* 1.6.28, Arrian, *Cyn.* 1.1).

For **ἀμφὶ δ' 17** see 8n., for **ἤσκηντο 17** see 6n.

In Q. **κατ' οὔρεα μακρά 17** is a formula (6x), whereas in H. κατ' οὔρεα and οὔρεα μακρά occur once each (Φ 485, Ν 18).

17-19 λέοντες /...θῶες... / ἄρκτοι σμερδαλέος, 'terrible', is a distinctively H. adj. favoured by Q., but whereas a large proportion of the H. occurrences are adv., in Q. the proportion is much smaller, and he applies the adj. to a much greater variety of subjects, including lions (also 7.716), snakes (below at 39 and 6.258, 8.348) and jackals (10.182). Seen in this light, the choice of adj. here need not have been consciously determined by its application to the pair of lions at Σ 579.

18 θῶες ἀναιδέες = 12.518. Q. clearly felt the adj. was appropriate to jackals, but not exclusively so, as he applies it also to a lion (7.464) and to bears (10.181). Its choice in this case follows the precedent of both Oppian (*Hal.* 2.625) and pseudo-Oppian (*Cyn.* 4.213).

18 ἀλεγειναὶ (see 15n.) is an epic adj. somewhat overworked by Q. (82x), used mostly of inanimate subjects. Its application to bears and leopards 18-19 is unusual, the only other comparable application in Q. being to an unspecified sea creature (3.271). The only H. precedent is rather different, of the horses of Achilles meaning 'troublesome' in a particular way (Κ 402, Ρ 76). The arbitrary character of such epithets is shown by comparison with the similar list 10.181-4. In the present passage (17-19) formal variety is obtained by the two enjambments with reversal of the noun-adj. sequence.

MSS. are divided between **πορδάλιες 19** and παρδ-. Vian (*Rech.* 167) believes Q. favoured πόρδ- in spite of its condemnation by Aristarchus for H., but MS. divergence in most of its occurrences in Q. (see Vian and Battegay s.v.) makes this uncertain.

19 σύες δ' ἅμα τοῖσι Rhodomann's emendation δ' is adopted by Vian, for MSS.' θ', and it is certainly preferable with τοῖσι, because that refers to the whole preceding list and requires stronger punctuation. With the variant τῇσι, θ' would give the required close link with the last two feminine nouns, but Pompella reads δ'...τῇσι.

20-21 ὄβριμοι ἀλγινόεντας...ἐυκτυπέοντας ὀδόντας is a conscious elaboration of the corresponding element in the principal H. model, θήγων λευκὸν ὀδόντα μετὰ γναμπτῇσι γένυσσι Λ 416, which is elaborated in a very different way by pseudo-Hesiod (*Scut.* 386-91). The three adjs. in one line may be felt as weak and excessive, especially after the preceding list and in view of the fact that ἀλγινόεις is just a formal variant of ἀλεγεινός (cf. 18), well established in epic, though non-H., and favoured by Q. Q.'s very frequent use of the epic ὄβριμος, 'strong', conforms to the H. practice of confining it mostly to warriors and weapons, so that its present application is abnormal. The mostly epic βλοσυρός, synonym of δεινός, was used since H. particularly of facial expressions, both of humans and of animals.

Although **καναχηδόν 21** naturally qualifies θήγοντες, its juxtaposition with ἐυκτυπέοντας emphasises the tautology of the two words, καναχή, -έω / κτύπος, -έω and related forms being more or less interchangeable. The adv. καναχηδόν is a late-epic formal variant, favoured by Q. (4x), of καναχηδά (first in Hesiod). Q. may have been encouraged to regard it as a *mot juste* in this context by the description of Achilles Τ 365 τοῦ καὶ ὀδόντων μὲν καναχὴ πέλε.

The compound **ἐυκτυπέοντας 21** is a *hapax* possibly coined by Q. Koechly doubts its genuineness and reads it as two words in spite of the awkwardness of having a second adv. The doubt may be dismissed in the light of Q.'s overall usage of present participles compounded with εὖ: H. εὐφρονέων 4x, once each εὐθαλέων and εὐμενέων, both found in Hellenistic epic, and εὐκομόων and εὐπνείων, both *hapaxes*. At 1.677 MSS. are divided between ἀεικτυπέοντι and ἀεὶ κτ., and Vian prefers the latter, perhaps wrongly. A final question is whether the rhyme of ἐυκτυπέοντας ὀδόντας is for intentional effect. One must allow for the possibility of indifference on Q.'s part (cf. e.g. 76 below, μακρὴν...ἄκρην), but it is likely that he intends to recall the sound effect of κόμπος ὀδόντων at the line end in the H. simile that is his model here (Λ 417, also Μ 149).

Q. has visualised the deployment of hunters in two groups, indicating their positions relative to the prey with contrasted advs. **μετόπισθε 22** and **καταντίον 24**, dogs being used behind and stones and javelins in front. There is a similar pattern in two Iliadic similes that follow shortly after the model boar-hunt simile: Λ 548-55 a lion is first driven off by men and dogs and then retreats before javelins and torches; Μ 41-8 a boar or a lion is surrounded by dogs and hunters, who then face it with javelins. Q.'s combination of stones and javelins may be new in the context, but it appears elsewhere with the same words (23 = 8.398,~ 6.360-1). A plurality of beasts is much commoner in Q.'s similes and related descriptions than in H.'s.

22 κυνῶν μένος Q. is even more fond of the H. periphrasis of μένος plus gen. of name or common noun (45x, cf. e.g. 35 below) than he is of that with σθένος (see 4n.).

For **ὡς ἐτεόν περ 24** see 13n.

25-42

Scene 3, slaughter in battle, with associated personifications and monsters. Battles are shown, in which men and horses are killed, and the ground is soaked with blood (25-8). Personified Φόβος, Δεῖμος and Ἐνυώ are spattered with blood (29-30). Personified Ἔρις rouses men to fight, and the Ἐρινύες breathe fire (31-3). Personified Κῆρες and Θάνατος move among the Ὑσμῖναι, blood and sweat flowing from their limbs (34-7). Gorgons are shown with snakes in their hair (38-40). The concluding comment is that the lifelikeness of all this inspires wonder and fear (40-2).

Length of descriptive elaboration varies only within a narrow range, so that there is no strong emphasis on any one element. But the battle description proper, just two-and-a-half lines (26-8), is inconspicuous compared with the list of personifications, as is noted by Kakridis (54). The passage is heavily articulated with ἐν δέ (ἄρα) 6x and ἀμφὶ δέ (ἄρα) 3x, the only change from these dominant connectives (see 8n.) being at 40 for the final element.

As noted above (on 1-120), the only similarity to this general description of warfare in the passage describing the city at war on the H. Shield is the four-line description of personified Ἔρις, Κυδοιμός and Κήρ (Σ 535-8), which appears to be an interpolation from pseudo-Hesiod, *Scut.* 156-9 (see M.W. Edwards on Σ 535-8, comm. 1991). Several other passages in the *Scut.* contain similar personifications: 144-50 (Φόβος, Ἔρις), 154-5 (five), 191-6 (Ἄρης, Δεῖμος, Φόβος), 248-57 (Κῆρες); 229-37 describe Gorgons pursuing Perseus. In the *Iliad* three passages are especially relevant: Δ 439-45, Ares and Athena are accompanied by personified Δεῖμος, Φόβος and Ἔρις, the last of which is described allegorically; Ε 738-42, Athena's aegis displays Φόβος, Ἔρις, Ἀλκή, Ἰωκή and a Gorgon's head; Λ 36-7, Agamemnon's shield has a Gorgon, Δεῖμος and Φόβος. The influence of such passages is widely diffused among the battle narratives of Q., though with notable concentration in book 8: 1.308-11 (Κυδοιμός, Θάνατος, Κῆρες), 6.350-1 (Κυδοιμός, Φόνος), 8.186-7 (Ἐνυώ), 191-2 (Ἔρις), 286-8 (Ἐνυώ), 324-8 (Κῆρες, Μόρος, Ἔρις, Ἄρης), 425-6 (Ἐνυώ, Πόλεμος), 9.145-7 (Κῆρες, Ἔρις), 10.53-65 (Ἔρις, Φόβος, Δεῖμος—the most elaborate example), 11.8-15 (Ἔρις, Ἐνυώ, Κῆρες, Φόβος, Ἄρης, Δεῖμος), 151-3 (Κῆρες, Ἄρης, Ἐνυώ), 13.85 (Ἄρης, Ἐνυώ). In these passages, as in the present one, personifications are sometimes accompanied by similar but not identical descriptions. This needs to be borne in mind when considering any examples of similarity of detail between the present passage and earlier ones.

The initial focus, 25-27, is on human beings and their horses as victims of war. For the importance of horses cf. e.g. Β 761-7; there is perhaps conscious contrast with the dogs in the preceding hunting scene. This provides the background for the monstrous personifications. There is no explicit personification of **πόλεμοι** and **κυδοιμοί 25**, such as accompanies the entities that follow, but it may be felt retrospectively, and the words are personified elsewhere by Q., as noted above.

25 π. φθισήνορες is a variant of the H. formula πόλεμον φθισήνορα (5x). Elsewhere Q. applies φθ. to the synonym χάρμη (3x). The adj. helps underline the contrast with hunting.

26 ἐνέκειντο is equivalent to pluperf. pass. of ἐντίθημι, the active of which is used repeatedly in the H. Shield (Σ 541, 550, 561, 606). It recurs twice in the same *sedes* in Q.'s ecphrases, 36 and 10.186.

26 περικτείνοντο δὲ λαοί/ is a modification of περικτείνοντο καὶ ἄλλοι/ Δ 538, which Q. reflects even more closely 7.619 π. καὶ

ἄλλων. The only other occurrence of the compound is περικτεινώμεθα Μ 245. In both H. passages MSS., editors and lexica are divided as to whether περι- should be a separate word, support for which is found λ 412-3. Lexica have overlooked Q.'s isolated revival of the word, which amounts to H. exegesis.

27 μίγδα θοοῖς ἵπποισι is preferable to the variant μ. ἑοῖς ἵ., which involves abnormal hiatus (see Vian, *Rech.* 213), and the adj.-noun combination, though not H., is favoured by Q. (5x).

27-8 πέδον...αἵματι.../ δευομένῳ ἤικτο There is play with the fact that the ground, πέδον, in the scene only appears to be such and is really the surface of the shield. Thus a straightforward statement like 3.22-3 αἵματι γαῖα / δεύετο is replaced by an awkward construction with πέδῳ understood. For the form of expression, ἤικτο='was like', cf. 12.411 μαινομένῳ δ' ἤικτο.

28 κατ' ἀσπίδος κατά plus gen. is used interchangeably with κατά plus acc. by Q. as a vague indication of position.

28 ἀσπίδος ἀκαμάτοιο/ = 8.348, 11.478. Application of ἀκ. to armour (cf. also 224, 6.233, 11.407) is an unusual transference of its application to persons; cf. A.R.'s transference of the adj. from oarsmen to oars 2.661.

From blood soaking the ground (27-8) to blood spattering the personifications of warfare (29-30) is a natural progression. The main inspiration for this was doubtless Σ 538 = *Scut.* 159 εἶμα δ' ἔχ' ἀμφ' ὤμοισι δαφοινεὸν αἵματι φωτῶν.

For **Φόβος** and **Δεῖμος** together 29 see 25-42n.

The linking of **'Ενυώ** with them may be original. The two Iliadic appearances of 'Ενυώ, as companion of Athena Ε 333 and of Ares Ε 592, are reflected by Q. resp. 1.365 and 3.85. In all eleven appearances in Q. 'Ενυώ is fully personified. Its use as a common noun = πόλεμος appears first in Triphiodorus and then frequently in Nonnus.

29 στονόεσσά τ' 'Ενυώ/ = 11.8, 13.85.

30 αἵματι...ἅψεα πάντα/ ~ 8.287-8 ἀλγινόεντι λύθρῳ πεπαλαγμένη ὤμους / καὶ χέρας, of 'Ενυώ. Both are variations on the H. formula αἵματι καὶ λύθρῳ πεπαλαγμένον (3x), of a warrior after battle. It is indicative of Q.'s technique that he has six other cases of this participle with either αἵματι or λύθρῳ, none with both. Of Q.'s frequent uses of epic λευγαλέος (52x, cf. 35 below) 7.146-7 λύθρῳ / λευγαλέῳ is noteworthy. ἅψεα πάντα/ is H. in λύθεν δέ οἱ ἅψεα πάντα δ 794 = σ 189, of the effect of sleep, where ἅψεα has its proper meaning 'joints'. But the present context requires 'limbs'; cf. 37 below and 13.144. ἅψεα = 'limbs' is probable in A.R. (see Vian on 3.676, ed.1961) and certain in Oppian and pseudo-Oppian.

The symmetry of two participial phrases referring back to noun-adj. subjects in the same order (31-3) is modified by enjambment of the first.

31-3 ἐν δ' Ἔρις.../...ἐποτρύνουσα...ἄνδρας / ἐλθέμεν ~ *Scut.* 148 δεινὴ Ἔρις...κορύσσουσα κλόνον ἀνδρῶν; cf. also *Scut.* 156 ἐν δ' Ἔρις. For οὐλομένη cf. T 91-2 Ἄτη.../ οὐλομένη and Q.'s own application of it to Κήρ (4x) as well as to Ἔρις again 9.146-7.
With **κλόνον 32** after prep. in this *sedes* Q. follows H. (7x, Q. 31x). Only occasionally does he add an adj. (5x); for the present combination cf. 9.252.
31-3 καὶ Ἐριννύες.../.../...πνείουσαι ἀυτμήν Vian prefers the incorrect spelling Ἐριννύς in spite of considerable MS. support for Ἐρινύς in Q. (see Vian and Battegay s.v. and West, *C.R.* 36 [1986] 310). The presence of Ἐρινύες, properly spirits of punishment, among personifications of war and its effects is surprising. The only hint of such an association in early epic is Hesiod's attribution to Κῆρες of the usual role of Ἐρινύες *Th.* 217, 220-2 (see West ad loc. and cf. Sommerstein, *Eumenides* [ed. 1989] introd. 8). But Q.'s intention here seems to be to indicate an etymological connection between Ἐρινύες and Ἔρις (see G. Neumann, "Wortbildung und Etymologie von *Erinus*", *Die Sprache* 32 [1986] 43-51). At 11.8-10 Q. likens both Ἔρις and Ἐνυώ to the Ἐρινύες, where further description is reminiscent of the present passage, ὀλοὸν πνείουσαι ὄλεθρον. For fire-breathing Ἐρινύες Q. had at least the precedent of Euripides, *I.T.* 288; for monsters in general cf. first Chimaera Z 182. It may be more than coincidental that at 8.243-4 Q. makes Ἐρινύς mother of the fire-breathing horses of Ares. To complete the picture, cf. 10.62 πυρὸς δ' ἄμπνυεν ἀυτμήν, of Ἔρις. Q. favours Hesiodic ὀβριμόθυμος (27x), avoiding H. -εργός.
The list **Κῆρες, Θανάτου μένος, Ὑσμῖναι 34-37** is embellished with alternating connectives, a different verb and adj. in each case and a culminating relat. clause describing all three. Two of the verbs, ἔθυνον and φοίτα, differ from the others in this passage in denoting movement. Θάνατος and Ὑσμῖναι do not appear in earlier passages of this type, and in Q.'s own examples only Θάνατος is found (1.310). In placing Θάνατος after Κῆρες Q. was doubtless influenced by the fact that in H. both κῆρες and κήρ are frequently either paired with θάνατος or qualified by its gen.
34 Κῆρες ἔθυνον ἀμείλιχοι The noun-adj. combination is a favoured formula with Q. (7x), the adj. being used with notable frequency (39x, cf. 3x in H.). It is curious that of Q.'s five other uses of θύνω two are with adv. ἀμείλιχα, 379, 14.509-10. Possibly influential here was the repeated use of the related form ἐθύνεον *Scut.* 156, 210, 257, 286.
35 φοίτα...μένος Of Q.'s three other uses of the form φοίτα one refers to Ἔρις, 10.55. For λευγαλέος see 30n., and for periphrasis with μένος see 22n.

36 Ὑσμῖναι ἐνέκειντο δυσηχέες For ἐνέκειντο see 26n. With δυσηχής Q. partly follows its use in the *Iliad*, where it is confined to the formulae πολέμοιο δυσηχέος (7x) and θανάτοιο δ. (3x). Of his twenty-four uses (in the same *sedes*) all but two are gen. sing., 7x after πολέμοιο and 2x after θανάτοιο. The present case is made less exceptional by the fact that ὑσμίνη is one of several synonyms of πόλεμος to which Q. applies δ.

36-7 ὧν περὶ πάντων/...αἷμα καὶ ἱδρώς is repeated verbatim from 2.530-1, except that ὧν περὶ replaces ἀλλ' ἄρα. Reference there is to armies in combat; here it is transferred to the associated personifications. Comparison of opening phrases in both cases supports the view that here περὶ is adv. intensifying πάντων, not prep., which would be awkward followed by ἐκ. Vian and Battegay class this with Q.'s quite frequent uses of adv. περί (cf. esp. 2.504-5). Rhodomann's emendation to adv. πάντῃ was only justified by the variant πάντα. More natural phrasing is achieved by taking πάντων with ὧν rather than with μελέων, so that ὧν must refer to the whole preceding list. The climactic force of this macabre description is assisted by the extent to which it echoes both 27-8 and 30. It may have been suggested by that of Ἀχλύς *Scut.* 267-8, τῆς ἐκ μὲν ῥινῶν μύξαι ῥέον, ἐκ δὲ παρειῶν / αἷμ' ἀπελείβετ' ἔραζ'. αἷμα καὶ ἱδρώς recurs only as a variant 8.234 in addition to the passage cited above, but Q. associates blood with sweat also 4.354-5 and 6.582-3. The one similarity in passages of the present type is the description of Ἐνυώ 8.288, ἐκ δέ οἱ αἰνὸς ἀπὸ μελέων ῥέεν ἱδρώς.

38-40 Γοργόνες ἔσκον... /..../ αἰνὸν λιχμώωντες For early-epic precedents in this type of scene see 25-42n. It should be noted that although Q. does not use the motif in his other examples of the type, he has the Gorgon Medusa twice in ecphrasis: 10.195 Perseus slays Medusa on the quiver of Philoctetes, and 14.454-6 the head of Medusa on the aegis of Athena is topped by fire-breathing snakes. The Gorgons that pursue Perseus *Scut.* 229-37 differ in having pairs of snakes round their waists, in accordance with archaic iconography (Vian II 203n.4), but cf. esp. *Scut.* 235 /λίχμαζον δ' ἄρα τώγε. Q. no doubt consciously adjusted his description to accord with the usual portrayal of Medusa. Possibly influential, though not for details, was Perseus with the Gorgon's head on the shield of Achilles described by Euripides, *Electra* 458-64. For the depiction of Gorgons on shields generally see *LIMC* s.v. Gorgo, Gorgones E.

The pattern of Q.'s expression in **39** reflects part of A.R.'s description of Hecate, 3.1214-5 πέριξ δέ μιν ἐστεφάνωντο / σμερδαλέοι δρυΐνοισι μετὰ πτόρθοισι δράκοντες. Emphatic separation of adj. and noun at beginning and end of line is unusual for both poets (for Q. cf. 4.137, 6.105, 108, 7.396, and see Wifstrand, *Von Kallimachos zu Nonnos* 133-8); for a H. precedent with the same adj. in a thematically relevant passage cf. λ 609.

The use of **ἀναιδέες 38** and **σμερδαλέοι 39** in one sentence after the same at 17-18 reflects the limitations of Q.'s redundant adj. expression. **ἀμφὶ...σφι 38** followed by **περὶ πλοχμοῖσι 39** is a form of explanatory apposition (see Smyth and Messing, *Greek Grammar* 988). There seems to be intentional assonance in **πεπόνηντο περὶ πλ.** The verb denotes completed artistic production; see 5n., and for this verb cf. 6.212, 241, 7.202, 14.454.

40 / αἰνὸν λιχμώωντες = 12.458, ~ 6.213.

40-42 Ἀπειρέσιον δ' ἄρα... /.../...ἐοικότα κινυμένοισι This comment on the emotions inspired by the lifelikeness of the scene combines elements from earlier relevant passages: Σ 549 τὸ δὴ περὶ θαῦμα τέτυκτο, and for fear *Scut.* 149-50, 162-3. Fear is implied in comment on the baldric of Heracles λ 613-4, and in the closely similar description of the baldric of Philoctetes Q. comments 10.185 ἐκπάγλως ζωοῖσιν ἐοικότες.

For **δαίδαλα 41**, **ἀπειρέσιον 40** and lifelikeness see 4n. and 11n. Pauw's emendation of MSS.' μετ' to **μέγ' 41** has been generally accepted, as has the same by Struve at 127. The usual construction with φέρω = 'bring about, cause' is acc. and dat. or occasionally acc. and ἐπί plus dat.; see LSJ s.v. IV.3 and Vian and Battegay s.v. 2, and cf. esp. E 682 δεῖμα φέρων Δαναοῖσι, 11.198 φόβον δηίοισι φέρουσα and 6.260 μέγα δεῖμα καὶ ἀθανάτοισιν ἰδέσθαι.

42 ἐοικότα κινυμένοισι = 7.203, ~ 6.201, 13.10.

43-44

See above (on 1-120) for the function of these lines in articulating the scenes on the shield into two groups, two scenes of war (17-42) and five of peace (45-96). Vian (II 7 n.5) suggests that in emphasising this aspect Q. may have been influenced by such allegorical interpretation of the H. Shield as that recorded by Heraclitus (*Alleg.* 49.2-4).

43 τεράατα πάντα τέτυκτο/ is formally a variant of τέτυκτο δὲ τείρεα πάντα/ 9 above, although it is doubtful whether Q. would have regarded τείρεα, with its lengthened first syllable and special meaning 'constellations', as the same word. Forms of τέρας in -τος etc. are relatively late, and τεράατα for τέρατα, with metrically lengthened second syllable, is an epic form that appears only once before Q., Dion. Per. 604. Thus Q.'s use of it 4x in the same *sedes* is remarkable; cf. esp. 6.275, of Centaurs on the shield of Eurypylus.

In the last passage, as in the present, the meaning is 'monsters', which here gives a striking contrast with **εἰρήνης ...περικαλλέα ἔργα 44**. Vian and Pompella are alone among editors in adopting Lascaris' emendation περικαλλέα ἔργα in place of MSS.' -έος ἔργα. Hiatus in observance of digamma in this *sedes* would be consistent with Q.'s practice (see Koechly, *prol.* xxxix, Vian, *Rech.* 218, and cf. e.g. 59 below), but neglect of digamma is equally acceptable (cf. e.g. 65 below). The phrase is

an isolated counterpart of Q.'s frequent use of ἔργα in reference to war, which does not provide decisive support for either reading. 7.683 γυναικῶν κάλλιμα ἔργα may be felt to support the emendation, but in the absence of clear preference for this pattern on Q.'s part περικαλλέος ἔργα should be retained.

45-48

Countless nations of men are shown living in cities that are watched over by personified Justice, Δίκη. They apply themselves to various tasks and their lands produce abundantly.

This is stated above (on 1-120) to be part of scene 4. The impression that it is intended as a separate scene requires careful consideration. Koechly (6-101n.) and Keydell (*R.E.* 1280) see it as a brief reflection of the H. vintage scene Σ 561-72, which is not otherwise included in Q.'s shield description. Similarity is limited to **47-8 ἀλωαὶ/... βρίθοντο** ~ Σ 561 βρίθουσαν ἀλωήν, but Q.'s nonspecific qualification **καρποῖσι**, as opposed to H.'s σταφυλῇσι, should alert us to the fact that ἀλωή, in both H.'s and Q.'s usage, denotes any cultivated land, not just 'vineyard', and such a limitation would conflict with Q.'s emphasis on various unspecified tasks.

Even less can be said for Kakridis' view (54) that the scene reflects the trial in the H. city at peace, Σ 497-508; the only point of contact is **46 ἄστεα καλά** ~ Σ 490-1 πόλεις.../καλάς. Vian's conclusion (II 6n.4) is surely correct, that this is not a separate scene, but a summary foreshadowing the scenes that follow, esp. 49-68; this interpretation is endorsed by Byre (*op. cit.* 186). A further consideration is that the vague plurality employed by Q. at this point is incompatible with a single scene. Keydell (*ibid.*) identifies a source of inspiration in Odysseus' picture of prosperity under a just ruler τ 109-14, esp. 48 ~ τ 111-2. Keydell's further suggestion is convincing, that τ 114 ἀρετῶσι δὲ λαοί prompted Q.'s following description of the mountain of Ἀρετή. However, in view of the latter's primarily Hesiodic background (see 49-56n.) equal importance for content, though not for expression, should be assigned to Hesiod's description of the prosperity of a πόλις in which justice prevails, *Op.* 225-37. Also possibly influential was Aratus' picture of personified Δίκη living with the golden race, *Phaen.* 100-14; cf. esp. **45 φῦλα...ἀνθρώπων** with *Phaen.* 102-3. Simply for the image of Δίκη on a shield Q. may have recalled Aeschylus, *Septem* 642-8, a description of the shield of Polynices.

45 φῦλα πολυτλήτων ἀνθρώπων/ = 1.135. Vian justifies his translation of the adj. as 'laborieux' ('hard-working') by Q.'s use of it elsewhere as equivalent to πολύτλας (e.g. 361 of Odysseus) and by his similar semantic extension of πολύκμητος and μογερός. More to the point, its application to χεῖρας 1.182 and 14.557 supports its being understood here as anticipating the statement of varied work in 47.

46 Δίκη δ' ἐπεδέρκετο πάντα may consciously reflect the verb's use by Hesiod for the 'oversight' of justice by Zeus' all-seeing eye, *Op.* 267-9; it is used similarly 5x by Q.
47 ἐπὶ ἔργα χέρας φέρον The expression seems to be original; cf. 13.547 χεῖρα βαλεῖν ἐπὶ...ἔργα.
The MSS.' reading **καρποῖσι βρίθοντο 48** is preferable to Koechly's καρποῖς ἐβρίθοντο because Q. never uses the augment at the expense of the usual epic dat. pl. ending (see Vian, *Rech.* 220n.4).
48 μέλαινα...γαῖα is an adaptation of H. γαῖα μ. (7x, used by Q. 4x); see above for its special relevance at τ 111.
49-56
Scene 4, the mountain of 'Αρετή. On a steep and rugged mountain 'Αρετή is shown standing on top of a palm tree, touching the sky. On all sides paths blocked by thorns deter the approach of men. Just a few come sweating up 'the sacred way'.

As a counterpart to the many personifications of Scene 3 Q. now presents just one, that of 'Αρετή, 'excellence', 'virtue'. Its elaboration constitutes the most original element in the shield description and has generated perhaps more discussion than any other passage of the *PH.* Koechly notes its uniqueness among extant shield descriptions and cites its literary antecedents. The most important is Hesiod, *Op.* 287-92:

> Evil (κακότης) is easy to obtain, the road to it smooth and short. But in front of ἀρετή the gods have placed sweat (ἱδρώς); the road (οἶμος) to it is long, steep (ὄρθιος) and rough (τρηχύς), but easy when one reaches the top.

The mountain indicated by Hesiod is made explicit by Q. with **'Αρετῆς ὄρος 50**, and most of his description reflects Hesiod's, with some verbal correspondence (**τρηχύ 50** ~ τρηχύς, **οἶμον 56** ~ οἶμος, **ἱδρώοντες 56** ~ ἱδρῶτα, **αἰπύτατον 49** and **αἰπά 55** ~ ὄρθιος). Q. reflects the same model also 12.292-6:

> The gods place suffering close to men, but good things far away, with toil (πόνος) in between. The way to evil (κακότης) is easy, but that to glory (κῦδος) painful, until one has gone through toil.

Here ἀρετή is replaced by κῦδος. Q. has several variations on the commonplace of toil as a necessary means to virtue or glory (1.738, 2.76-7, 6.451, 9.104-5, 12.71-2).

In the present passage what stands out as entirely novel in relation both to Hesiod and to the later literary tradition is the description of Arete standing on a palm tree 50-2. That tradition begins with Xenophon's elaborate description (*Mem.* 2.1.21-34, after Prodicus) of the choice presented to the young Heracles between the long and difficult path to virtue (ἀρετή) and the short and easy one to evil (κακία), true goods being achieved only by toil, care and sweat (πόνος, ἐπιμέλεια, ἱδρώς). The

novelty within the tradition of Q.'s image of Arete on the palm is emphasised by his further development of it at 14.195-200. The shade of Achilles exhorts his son Neoptolemus as follows:

> No one reaches the goals (τέρματα) of ἀρετή without good sense, because its trunk (πρέμνον) is hard to climb and its branches are high. But with strength and toil one can gather its fruit, after climbing the glorious tree of fair-crowned (ἐυστέφανος) 'Αρετή.

In neither passage is the bodily appearance of Arete described, and in the later one she/it is virtually identified with the fruit of the palm, which is a metaphor for the rewards of a virtuous life. Koechly observes that in both cases there is an implied application of the image to Achilles, which is appropriate because he, like Xenophon's Heracles, has made a famous choice, that of the short but glorious life (I 410-6). This is surely the key to Q.'s intention in the present passage. It is a notable example of a thematic link between the shield description and its narrative context, such as is absent from its H. model.

S.E. Bassett ("The Hill of Success", *CJ* 20 [1925] 414-8) argues that for Q. ἀρετή has the non-moral meaning 'success' in keeping with early-epic usage, which is supported by the equivalence of κῦδος 12.295. He suggests influence on Q. of the *Tabula* (Πίναξ) attributed to Cebes (poss. I A.D.), esp. its description of the path to true education 15-18. It represents the tradition familiar to Q., but the case for direct influence is not strong. As regards Arete on the palm, Bassett argues for the likely influence of visual art, citing Nike over an olive tree on the W. pediment of the Parthenon and a well-known temple of Arete at Smyrna (Philostratus, *Vit. Soph.* 1.25 [543]).

Kakridis (54-6) emphasises the novelty of Q.'s introduction of moral allegory into epic ecphrasis, but argues against the image of Arete on the palm being Q.'s original invention. The allusive brevity of the image, both in the present passage and at 14.195-200, strongly suggests its assumed familiarity to the reader. Kakridis notes the relevance of the palm as a symbol of victory and cites Plutarch (*Quaest. Conviv.* 8.4 [723-4]) for interest in the question why palm branches were awarded to victors at the games. For the possibility of local influence on Q. he notes the existence of a sacred grove at Smyrna named Φοινικῶν (*C.I.G.* 3148).

Vian (II 203-5) gives full references for the related themes of the mountain of Arete and the paths to good and evil. He argues that the importance of toil as a means to virtue, emphasised by Q. elsewhere (see above), is implied in the present passage by placement of the allegory between mention and description of agricultural labour (45-8 and 57-65), and within the allegory the difficulty of ascent is described with more realism than in the Hesiodic model. He suggests that in introducing the palm Q. may have been influenced by the notion, widespread in the Near East, of a sacred tree at the centre of the earth together with a goddess of fertility. The palm was the sacred tree *par excellence*, and Q. describes (11.92-8) the palms that surrounded

the burning rock of Hephaestus at Corycus. As a precedent for a tree bearing a deity Vian cites the bronze palm bearing Athena at Delphi, which commemorated the Athenian victory at the Eurymedon (Pausanias, 10.15.4-5), and also a similar motif on coins of Myra in Lycia.

The latest and fullest treatment of the topic is by C.S. Byre (*op. cit.*). He argues that Q.'s allegory must be interpreted as closely integrated with the following scenes, both of harvesting and ploughing (57-65) and of banqueting and dancing (66-8). In supplementing Vian's account of the literary tradition he notes that Q.'s concentration on one of the two alternatives of good and evil is shared by the *Tabula* and later by Nonnus, *Dion.* 20.94-8 (see Hopkinson *ad loc.*, ed. 1994), but without close similarity between the versions. He identifies the closest background to Q.'s image of Arete and the palm as the use of the Greek letter Y as a graphic symbol for the alternative paths to good and evil, the *bivium vitae*, which was attributed to Pythagoras, but for which the earliest evidence, both literary and archaeological, dates from the first century A.D. Persius mentions this symbol (3.56-7, 5.34-5) in terms that indicate an established identification of it with the stem and branches of a tree. Secondly, a funerary stele for a Pythagorean from Philadelphia in Lydia features a large Y separating a scene of indolence on the left and one of toil on the right. The latter is placed over a figure of Arete and shows a man ploughing and a man reclining at a banquet, plausibly interpreted as a life of toil and its reward in the afterlife. Byre argues that the similarity between this and the scenes of ploughing and feasting that follow Q.'s mountain of Arete (57-68) is more than coincidental. His argument, however, is somewhat weakened by the consideration that Q.'s exclusive concentration on the one alternative obscures the symbolism of a tree as the parting of two ways.

In conclusion, the present passage is a rare example of Q.'s willingness to supplement the tradition of Greek epic not only from non-epic literature but also possibly from entirely non-literary sources. It is important as an exception to the rule of his literary conservatism.

49-50 αἰπύτατον.../...Ἀρετῆς ὄρος reflects H. formulae of the type Κυλλήνης ὄρος αἰπύ (B 603, the type 4x). Superlative of αἰπύς is rare, appearing first in the *Anthology* (7.351.4 Dioscorides III B.C., 9.790.4 Antipater of Sidon II B.C.); Q. uses it 3x, cf. esp. αἰπυτάτων ὀρέων 10.416.

For **θεοκμήτῳ ἐπὶ ἔργῳ/ 49** and the variant -δμήτῳ see 6n.

50 ζαθέης Ἀρετῆς Application of this adj. to a person is rare and late, though Hesiod's ζαθέης...γαίης (*Th.* 300, 483) may be taken to imply personification. In epic before Q. pseudo-Oppian applies it to Dionysus (*Cyn.* 4.232), and Q. himself to Achilles (14.304). Otherwise Q. reflects early epic in applying it mostly to places. In view of its early-epic use 3x with ὄρος (*Th.* 2, *H.h.Apoll.* 223, *h.Ven.* 258) it may be felt as transferred from the same here.

51 is similar to A.R. 4.1681 εἱστήκει προβλῆτος ἐπεμβεβαὼς σκοπέλοιο, of the Cretan giant Talos, except that Q. has κατά plus gen., reflecting his very free use of the construction (see 27-8n.). ἐπεμβαίνω governs either gen. like ἐπιβαίνω (thus in early epic) or dat. like ἐμβαίνω (thus 2x in Q.). Its use with a prep. is rare, and the one instance of κατά plus gen. cited by LSJ is justified by a special meaning (Sophocles, *El.* 835, see Jebb *ad loc.*), as the present case is not. The awkwardness is accentuated by formal identity with κατ᾽ ἄκρης = 'utterly'.
Similarly abnormal is **ψαύουσα πρὸς οὐρανόν 52** instead of gen. or dat. without prep. (both in Q.); cf. ἐπιψαύοντες plus acc. 12.551.
Change of **ὑψηλῇ 52** to -ῆς, as suggested by West, would conflict with natural phrasing.
The variant πάντες for **πάντῃ 52** may have influenced the corruption of **διειργόμεναι 53** to -οι in all MSS. after **/ἀτραπιτοί** fem. (= ν 195).
53 σκολόπεσσιν/, 'thorns', is certainly preferable as *lectio difficilior* to the variant σκοπέλοισι(ν), 'rocks', which is not recorded by Vian or Pompella, but see Zimmermann's apparatus. σκόλοψ = 'stake' is common from H. onwards, whereas the meaning 'thorn' is first attested IV B.C. (LSJ s.v. 2). As the latter suits the present context, its use by Q., isolated in epic, should be accepted as a notable innovation.
54 ἀνθρώπων..πάτον is a reversal of ι 119 οὐ μὲν γὰρ πάτος ἀνθρώπων ἀπερύκει (sc. αἶγας), with πάτος in both cases = 'frequenting, coming and going' (Cunliffe, *LHD* s.v.).
ἐὺν πάτον Application of the distinctively epic adj. to a word denoting action lacks H. precedent; among Q.'s frequent uses (21x, ἠΰς 29x) closest is ἐὺν δρόμον 2.504 (see Koechly *ad loc.*).
Emphasis on **πολλοὶ/ 54** and **/παῦροι 56** is enhanced by parallel position in their clauses and contrasted *sedes*.
αἰπὰ κέλευθα/ 55 (~ αἰπὰ ῥέεθρα/ Θ 369, Φ 9) is placed as close as possible to **ἱερὸν οἶμον 56**. The pl. follows ἀτραπιτοὶ 53, whilst the sing. reflects οἶμος in the Hesiodic model (see above), at the expense of visual consistency. This application of ἱερός is probably intended to recall the various specific uses of ἱερὰ ὁδός (LSJ s.v. 9).
56 ἱδρώοντες, placed at the line end in contrast to its counterpart τεθηπότες 55, leads naturally to the following scene of toil.

57-65

Scene 5, reaping and ploughing. Reapers with sickles, followed by binders, toil to bring the harvest in. Some oxen pull carts loaded with sheaves, whilst others plough fields, followed by men with ox-goads.
These ten lines (with 58a) are both a reflection of the twenty lines Σ 541-60 in the Shield of Achilles, with some verbal correspondence (see below), and a pointed departure from them. The separate scenes of ploughing (Σ 541-9)

and reaping (Σ 550-60) are combined into one, with oxen engaged in the seemingly simultaneous tasks of pulling carts and ploughs (60-62). Greater brevity is achieved partly by omission of the prominent H. elements of drinking in the ploughing scene and of the feast in the reaping scene. Q. has no equivalent to the following H. scene of vintage (Σ 561-72). The H. sequence of three scenes is followed in the pseudo-Hesiodic imitation, *Scut.* 286-301. Vian observes that Q. seems to owe nothing to pseudo-Hesiod's expression, but see below on λήιον αὖον (58a). Q.'s descriptions of reaping and ploughing give the impression of reversing the natural and traditional sequence, but that is not strictly true. His oxen are simply divided into the two operations without reference to temporal sequence, attention being concentrated exclusively on the visible arrangement of scenes. The passage is emphatically articulated into two unequal halves, beginning with Ἐν δ' ἔσαν ἀμητῆρες 57 and Ἐν δὲ βόες 60, and ending with the variants ἀέξετο δ' ἐς μέγα ἔργον 59 and ἀνεφαίνετο δ' ἄσπετον ἔργον 65. Parallelism of internal development is achieved with the variants ἐφεσπόμενοι δ' ἔσαν 58a and τοὶ δ' ἐφέποντο 63, although the first contrast is between groups of people and the second between oxen and men.

58a was so numbered by Zimmermann because it is absent from most MSS. and all earlier editions.

57 ἀμητῆρες occurs in the same *sedes* Λ 67 in the only H. reaping simile; the word is used 3x by Q. in similes.

57 ἀνὰ...ὄγμον reflects both μετ' ὄγμον Σ 552, where it means 'swathe' (cf. Σ 557, Λ 68), and ἀν' ὄγμους Σ 546, where it means 'furrow'. Vian and Battegay wrongly assign the latter meaning to its use here.

58 δρεπάνῃσι νεήκεσι corresponds with ὀξείας δρεπάνας Σ 551, but formally it reflects πελέκεσσι νεήκεσι Ν 391 = Π 481 in the same *sedes*; cf. esp. 4.426, 6.361.

58a ἤνυτο is Zimmermann's convincing emendation of (κ)αἴνυτο; the athematic form is H. (ε 243) and used by Q. 2x or 3x elsewhere. Its application to λήιον involves an easy but seemingly unparalleled extension of the latter's meaning from 'crop' to 'harvesting'. Thus Combellack translates "the harvest of ripe grain was being completed".

58a λήιον αὖον is Q.'s formulaic substitute (4x) for the H. formula βαθὺ λήιον (3x); at 4.79 he combines the two in αὐαλέον β. λ. With the present example he alludes to (τέμενος) βαθυλήιον Σ 550, alternative reading for βασιλήιον; pseudo-Hesiod reflects the same at *Scut.* 288.

The periphrastic character of **ἐφεσπόμενοι...ἔσαν 58a** is emphasised by contrast with its counterpart in 63, but it is characteristic of the present description; cf. e.g. 57 and 68.

The most obvious verbal echo of the H. model in this passage is **ἀμαλλοδετῆρες 59**, which is virtually a H. *hapax* at Σ 553 and 554. Its use in apposition to ἄλλοι may be influenced by ἄλλα δ' ἀ. Σ 553, whilst πολλοὶ seems to be in pointed contrast to τρεῖς...ἀ. Σ 554. The word is

avoided by pseudo-Hesiod, and in later poetry there is only the formal variant ἀμαλλοδέτης, first used by Theocritus (10.44). It is therefore noteworthy that Q. uses the H. form also at 2.185.

59 ἀέξετο δ' ἐς μέγα ἔργον, the reading of all MSS., is emended by Koechly (after Hermann) to ἀ. δὲ μ. ἔ., with lengthening before initial μ, which, as Koechly notes, gives a closer parallel with ἀνεφαίνετο...ἔργον 65. Vian defends ἐς with ἀέξετο by reference to similar expressions at 264 and 1.459-60. But the main objection to the MSS.' reading is the uncertainty as regards the understood subject of ἀέξετο—perhaps λήιον = 'harvest'. Also, a possible source of corruption is δ' ἔσαν in the preceding line. Accordingly there is a case for emendation, but it is less than compelling.

The quite elaborate description of oxen pulling carts and ploughs **60-65** is an innovation in relation to the H. model, where they are no more than implied by ζεύγεα Σ 543. General inspiration was drawn from the H. simile of ploughing oxen N 703-7, which is closely imitated by Q. in a simile 6.107-11, with the significant change from plough to cart, ἀπήνη.

61 ἐυσταχύεσσιν ἀμάλλαις Both words, though rare and not H., occur in poetry before Q., who uses them elsewhere, ἐύστ. 1x and ἄμ. 2x.

62 /βριθομένας is emphasised by enjambment that gives greater weight to the first of two contrasted clauses.

62 αὖτις All MSS. but one read αὖθις, but the Ionic-epic form is to be preferred; see Vian and Battegay s.v. and Vian, *Rech.* 165. The word simply strengthens the contrast of μέν and δέ with the adversative meaning that belongs properly to αὖ and αὖτε. This is recognised by Vian and Battegay as a unique exception in Q.'s use of αὖτις. It appears not to be H., but is recognised for early epic by *LFE* s.v. B4. Koechly's translation 'denuo' is out of place in the present description of visible scenes. For the *figura etymologica* **ἀροτρεύεσκον ἀρούρας 62** cf. Hesiod, *Op.* 460 ἀρόων ἀρότοιο καθ' ὥρην and Theognis 582 ἄρουραν ἀροῦν (metaphorical).

63 τῶν...μελαίνετο is a variation of Σ 548 ἡ δὲ μελαίνετ' ὄπισθεν; the change to μετόπισθε adds an element of assonance.

64 /αἰζηοί, -ούς, -ῶν occur in this *sedes* 21x in Q., but in H. always at the line end (16x).

64 βοοσσόα κέντρα Application of the adj. to ox-goads may be novel, because its only earlier application, in the form βουσόος, is to the gadfly (Callimachus frag. 301, Cercidas frag. 8.2). Q. may have been prompted by the fact that κέντρον sometimes denotes the sting of such creatures.

65 ἀμοιβαδίης is a rare adj., but occurs in epic before Q. (pseudo-Oppian, *Cyn.* 4.349), so that Pauw's emendation to the commoner ἀμοιβαίης should be rejected. The literal implication of the whole phrase βοοσσόα...ἀμοιβαδίης, conveyed by Combellack with "carrying ox-goads

that they moved from hand to hand," is hardly acceptable from the point of view of feasibility. Q. is better understood as describing the visible scene, so that 'with alternate hands' means the artistic representation of goads held in different hands for the sake of pictorial symmetry.

ἀνεφαίνετο 65 denotes the appearance of the scene to an observer (thus Keydell, review of Vian II, *Gnomon* 40 [1968] 572), not the artist's work in representing it (thus Vian).

The equivalence of **ἄσπετον ἔργον 65** to μέγα ἔργον 59, noted above, illustrates the essential meaning of ἄσπετος, which Q. uses to excess (67x); the phrase recurs 6.236, 13.469; cf. 6.292.

66-72

Scene 6, part 1 (66-68): a feast is accompanied by the playing of *auloi* and lyres and the dancing of young people. Part 2 (69-72): nearby Aphrodite rises from the sea accompanied by Himeros and the Charites.

It is not clear whether this is envisaged as a single or two separate scenes. Most critics have preferred the second alternative, in which case **Ἄγχι δ' ἄρ' 69** is a unique introductory formula (see 8n.), but there is some advantage in seeing at least a specially close link between the two parts. As noted above (on 1-120), part 1 reflects something of the wedding scene in the city at peace on the H. Shield: **66 Ἐν δ' αὐλοὶ κιθάραι τε** ~ Σ 494-5 ἐν δ' ἄρα τοῖσιν/αὐλοὶ φόρμιγγες τε; **66 εἰλαπίνῃσι** ~ Σ 491 εἰλαπίναι τε. By itself, though, the scene is not only briefer, but it lacks explicit mention of a wedding. It is perhaps not too fanciful to see the juxtaposition of Aphrodite as an indirect way of indicating this. Be that as it may, it certainly provides a link with the following scene of the wedding of Peleus and Thetis, which Vian regards as displacing the wedding motif from the present scene. Mythological scenes are an important feature of ecphrasis in non-H. epic.

No literary model has been identified for the subject of the Aphrodite scene, and it is likely that with **ἀνεδύετο πόντου 70** Q. indicates his inspiration by Apelles' famous picture, Ἀφροδίτη ἀναδυομένη, or by a description of it; see LSJ ἀναδύομαι. That would account for Q.'s vivid pictorial detail. In addition to its immediate link with the next scene, this subject initiates the transition from terrestrial to marine activities, which is completed at 80ff.

67 ἐν δὲ χοροὶ...γυναικῶν has been variously understood. Combellack follows Vian with "beside the feet of young men stood groups of dancing women". But that involves the intolerable difficulty of breaking the natural links between χοροὶ and νέων and between ποσσὶ and γυναικῶν. This consideration led Kocchly to posit a lacuna after νέων and Zimmermann to rewrite the line. Neither expedient is necessary, because Lehrs' translation "illic choreae instituebantur iuvenum sub pedibus mulierum", which is dictated by the phrasing, gives satisfactory meaning. It clearly reflects Σ 494-6 κοῦροι δ' ὀρχηστῆρες ἐδίνεον...αἱ δὲ γυναῖκες

/ ἱστάμεναι θαύμαζον, except that the women are not standing by as spectators, but are also dancing, as is clarified by the next line.

67 χοροὶ ἵσταντο does not denote standing, but reflects such expressions as χοροὺς ἱστάναι; see LSJ χορός I. Q. may have been influenced secondarily by the different dancing scene Σ 593-4 ἔνθα μὲν ἠΐθεοι καὶ παρθένοι.../ὠρχεῦντ'.

For **νέων 67** cf. *Scut.* 281 νέοι κώμαζον ὑπ' αὐλοῦ in the corresponding scene.

67 παρὰ ποσσὶ is used 6x by Q. in this *sedes*.

For **ζωῇσιν ἀλίγκια 68** cf. *Scut.* 244 ζ. ἴκελαι, and for such comments on lifelikeness see 13n.

For the periphrasis **ἔσαν...ποιπνύουσαι 68** see 58a n. ποιπνύουσαι/ ~ A 600, υ149, 4.509.

With **εὐφροσύνης 69**, **ἀφρὸν 70** and also possibly **ἀνεδύετο 70** there is play on the name Aphrodite, for which **Κύπρις 71** is finally substituted.

The implication of **εὐφροσύνης ἐρατεινῆς**, significantly echoed by **μειδιόωσ' ἐρατεινά 72**, is virtually the opposite of Euripides' point in associating 'Αφροδίτη with ἀφροσύνη, *Tro.* 989-90, whether or not there is a conscious reference.

70 ἀνεδύετο πόντου / ~ ε337 ἀνεδύετο λίμνης/.

71 /Κύπρις ἐυστέφανος = 1.667; ~ἐ. Κυθέρεια H., Hesiod, 10.318.

71 τὴν δ' Ἵμερος ἀμφεποτᾶτο, which is strikingly similar to Sappho 22.11-12 πόθος...ἀμφιπόταται, is easily understood as parenthetical, so that emendation of **μειδιόωσ' 72**, an elegant reflection of the goddess' traditional epithet φιλομμειδής (cf. esp. Sappho 1.14), to -ων (adopted by Zimmermann and Pompella) is unnecessary; for a similar construction cf. Γ 410-1. The personified Χάριτες were traditional attendants of Aphrodite from H. onward, whilst Ἵμερος is twice personified by Hesiod, *Th.* 64 in association with the Χάριτες and *Th.* 201 as present with Eros at the birth of Aphrodite; cf. Ξ 216, unpersonified ἵμερος in her girdle.

72 ἠυκόμοις Χαρίτεσσιν ~ ἐυπλόκαμοι Χ. *H.h. Apoll.* 194; ἠ. itself is applied to various goddesses by H. and Hesiod, and by Q. 2x to νύμφη; here it balances ἐυστέφανος 71 and echoes κόμῃσιν 70.

73-79

Scene 7, the wedding of Peleus and Thetis. The Nereids lead Thetis up from the sea to the wedding. All the gods feast on Mount Pelion, surrounded by flowery meadows, groves and springs.

Vian claims that here too there are two distinct scenes, noting the similarity of Valerius Flaccus' treatment of the subject, *Arg.* 1.130-9. That, however, is different in that Thetis is first riding on a dolphin's back and then feasting with Peleus, and there are no similarities of detail. All the elements of Q.'s description can be simultaneous, with the repeated use of **ἀμφὶ δὲ 75**

and 77 reflecting his characteristic vagueness with the preposition (see 8n.). As noted above (on 1-120), this is the only scene on the shield that has an obvious thematic link with the narrative, and it is actually the fourth occasion on which Q. recalls it with some descriptive elaboration. The first two are in speeches of reproach addressed by Hera to Apollo 3.99-105 and to Zeus 4.50-54, both inspired by her citing of the gods' participation in the wedding to reproach Apollo ω 55-63. Q.'s third and longest treatment of the subject is in Nestor's hymn to Thetis 4.131-43. The treatment is substantially different in each case, but the following similarities are noteworthy: **74 ἐξ ἁλὸς...ἀνάγουσαι** ~ 3.102 ἁλὸς μέγα λαῖτμα λιποῦσαν; **75-76 πάντες / ἀθάνατοι δαίνυντο** ~ 4.53-54 πάντες ἐδαινύμεθ'...../ἀθάνατοι; **76 μακρὴν ἀνὰ Πηλίου ἄκρην** ~ 4.133 Πηλίου ἀμφὶ κάρηνα. In the present passage the weakness of Q.'s use of ornate epithets is apparent in **ὑπερθύμοιο 73, εὐρυπόροιο 74, δαΐφρονος 75**. In favouring the subject thus, Q. would have been aware of its popularity in pictorial art (for which see *LIMC* s.v. Peleus) as well as in literature.

73 Νηρῆος ὑπερθύμοιο θύγατρες/ = 2.498. The noun-adjective combination may be new, but it is not distinctive, ὑ. being applied to various subjects in H. & Q.

74 ἁλὸς εὐρυπόροιο ~ θαλάσσης ε. H. 3x, ε. θ. pseudo-Oppian, *Cyn.* 3.176, Q. 1.64; Q. also innovates by applying ε. 2x to rivers.

75 Αἰακίδαο δαΐφρονος occurs in H. 2x, Q. 5x, always in the same *sedes* and elsewhere always of Achilles.

The rhyme in **μακρὴν...ἄκρην 76** is probably accidental; see 21n. For μ. = 'high' of a mountain cf. μ. Ὄλυμπος *et sim.* in H. and Q.

For **ὑδρηλοί...λειμῶνες 77** cf. ι132-3 λ. ἁλὸς πολιοῖο παρ' ὄχθας / ὑδρηλοί, μαλακοί, esp. the proximity of the sea. εὐθαλής, 3x in Q., is not H.

78 ἔσκον is a weak enjambment.

78 κεκασμένοι = 'adorned, equipped', the post-H. sense found at least 6x in Q.

78 ἄνθεσι ποίης/ =14.207; ~ ἄνθεα π./ ι449.

For κρῆναι...καλῷ/ 79 cf. ε70 κρῆναι...ῥέον ὕδατι λευκῷ/. διειδής, 5x in Q., appears earlier at least mostly in prose. Emphasis on water here (ὑδρηλοί, ὕδατι) assists the following change to the sea.

80-96

Scene 8, a seascape in two clearly separated and almost equal parts, reflects the pattern of the two preceding scenes on a considerably larger scale and so forms a fitting culmination of the whole series. The contrast between the frightening storm of part 1 (80-87) and the joyful calm of part 2 (88-96) may be intended to reflect the articulation of the series in terms of the progression from war to peace, as noted above (on 1-120). Ships are driven in different directions by a rising storm (80-83). Frightened sailors try to

escape death by furling sails and by rowing (83-87). A smiling Poseidon calms the sea as he drives his horses across it (88-93), and he is greeted by joyful dolphins (93-96).

Explicit emphasis on lifelikeness, with repeated **ὡς ἐτεόν (περ) 84 and 90**, and with a unique mention of the metal used 96 (see 13n.), contributes to the sense of culmination. Q.'s principal models here do not belong to the H. Shield. For the first part it is the simile of the storm-tossed ship O 624-8: **82 ἀέξετο κῦμ' ἀλεγεινόν** ~ O 624-5 κῦμα...λάβρον...ἀνεμοτρεφές; **83-85 Ναῦται δὲ τεθηπότες...φοβέοντο...ἵν' ἐκ θανάτοιο φύγωσιν** ~ O 627-8 τρομέουσι δέ τε φρένα ναῦται / δειδιότες· τυτθὸν γὰρ ὑπὲκ θανάτοιο φέρονται. There is also some similarity to Hecuba's description, Eur., *Tro.* 686-93. Q has another variation on the theme in the simile at 364-6. The description of Poseidon driving across the sea is clearly influenced by that at N25-31: **89-90 ἀελλόποδες...φέρεσκον** ~ N31 τὸν δ'...εὐσκαρθμοι φέρον ἵπποι; **91 χρυσείῃ μάστιγι** ~ N25-26 ἱμάσθλην / χρυσείην; **91-92 ἀμφὶ δὲ κῦμα/στόρνυτ'** ~ N29 θάλασσα διΐστατο; **93-95 Τοὶ δ' ἑκάτερθεν...βασιλῆα** ~ N27-28 ἄταλλε δὲ κήτε' ὑπ' αὐτοῦ / πάντοθεν ἐκ κευθμῶν, οὐδ' ἠγνοίησεν ἄνακτα. The main differences in Q.'s version are that Poseidon's smile is reflected in the calming of the sea and that he is greeted by dolphins instead of unspecified sea creatures. Both these features are prominent in Moschus' description of the bull swimming with Europa, which reflects the same H. model, 2.115-7:

> ἡ δὲ τότ' ἐρχομένοιο γαληνιάασκε θάλασσα,
> κήτεα δ' ἀμφὶς ἄταλλε Διὸς προπάροιθε ποδοῖιν,
> γηθόσυνος δ' ὑπὲρ οἶδμα κυβίστεε βυσσόθε δελφίς·

The likelihood of direct influence is increased by Q.'s use of the same form **ἀμφίς (93)**, but the primary model for his description of the dolphins is the shield scene *Scut.* 209-12: **96 νηχομένοις...ἐόντες** ~ *Scut.* 211-2 νηχομένοις ἴκελοι...ἀργύρεοι δελφῖνες. Silver dolphins also feature in one of Virgil's scenes on the shield of Aeneas, *Aen.* 8.671-4, where one detail, 672 "fluctu spumabant caerula cano," is strikingly similar to Q.'s **μέλας λευκαίνετο πόντος 87**, with the same juxtaposition of contrasted colours. The possibility of Virgil's influence on Q. is considered by Vian (II 7n.3) in relation to two other passages. Neptune's calming of the stormy sea *Aen.* 1.142-7 is not close to Q.'s version in detail, but shortly before, 1.127 "placidum caput extulit" is not unlike Q.'s **Τοῖς δ' ἐπὶ μειδιόων 88**. Attention is called to the same difference from H. in Philostratus' description of this scene, *Imag.* 1.8.1 ἐνταῦθα δὲ φαιδρὸς γέγραπται καὶ ἱλαρὸν βλέπει. There is also similarity of expression to Q. in another Virgilian description of Neptune calming the sea, *Aen.* 5.821 /"sternitur aequor aquis" ~ **91-92 κῦμα/στόρνυτ'**.

Combellack's translation of **Νῆες...στονόεσσαι 80**, "ships in distress", is consistent with the usual meaning of στ. in H. and Q., "causing or associated with groans", and also appropriately anticipates the following description, whereas Vian's "des nefs à la carène gémissante" is less likely, though not impossible. Platt's emendation στονόεντος with πόντοιο, adopted by Pompella, is unnecessary.

In **αἳ μὲν...νισόμεναι 81-82** the varied movement of the ships is emphasised by chiasmus of contrasted phrases.

80-81 φέροντο/...ἐπικάρσιαι ~ ι70 αἱ (sc. νῆες) μὲν ἔπειτ' ἐφέροντ' ἐπικάρσιαι, 14.593 αἱ (sc. νῆες) μὲν γὰρ φορέοντ' ἐπικάρσιαι, which are the only occurrences of ἐ. in H. and Q. At ι70 ἐ. was understood either as 'headlong' like ἐπὶ κάρ Π392, or as 'drifting sideways' in accordance with its post-H. meaning. Here Q. indicates the latter by the contrast αἱ δὲ κατ' ἰθύ 81.

82 νισόμεναι is preferred to the variant νισσ. by Vian, as in other occurrences of ν., whilst the MSS. are inconsistent.

82 ἀέξετο κῦμ' (α) = κ93, 14.247.

Vian observes that **ἄλλοθεν ἄλλος 83** is awkward if taken with τεθηπότες and that it would be better with the following participle, if one emended **ἐσσυμένας 84** to -οι. But apart from the fact that the phrase is often used with verbs other than those of motion, it is perhaps possible to take ἄ. ἄ./ἐσσυμένας φοβέοντο together, "they feared the onrush...from different directions", which is bold and attractive.

84 καταιγίδας = 'squalls'; Q. uses the word 5x and perhaps innovates by introducing it to epic.

The description in **85-87** is influenced by μ170-2: **λαίφεα...ἐρύοντες** ~ μ170 ἱστία μηρύσαντο; **οἳ δ' ἕζοντ' ἐπ' ἐρετμὰ** ~ μ171-2 οἱ δ' ἐπ' ἐρετμὰ / ἑζόμενοι; **λευκαίνετο πόντος** ~ μ172 λεύκαινον ὕδωρ, which Q. makes more striking by juxtaposing μέλας.

88 Τοῖς δ' ἐπὶ μειδιόων <ἐν> κήτεσιν is Vian's emendation of the MSS.' ...ἐπιμειδιόων καὶ κ. He follows Koechly in taking Τοῖς δ' ἐπὶ with ἤσκητ' 89 as an indication of the placing of the scene, but the MSS.' reading gives the much more natural meaning 'smiling on them', i.e. the sailors (thus Pompella), and then, with καὶ..., 'and on the sea creatures'; see Lloyd-Jones *CR* 17 (1967) 275. Thus there is no need to emend. The smile of Poseidon echoes that of Aphrodite at 72.

89 ἀελλόποδες...ἵπποι Q.'s four uses of ἀ. are all as the epithet of horses, like that at *H.h. Aphr.* 217. The epithets of Poseidon's horses in the H. model are χαλκόποδ'...ὠκυπέτα Ν23-24.

91 πεπληγότες in a passive sense is an isolated introduction to epic of a late prose usage (see LSJ s.v.); Q.'s only other uses of this participle, 3.548, 4.559, are active.

91 ἀμφὶ δὲ κῦμα at the start of the calming is in pointed contrast to 82.

With **ἐπεσσυμένων** **92** ἵππων is easily understood, but the variant -ως deserves serious consideration. The adv. ἐπεσσυμένως, 'eagerly, violently, rapidly', occurs in Q. 3x in all MSS. (1.388, 6.537, 7.499) and 3x in the important MS. P alone (5.92, 270, 13.39), but in all cases it is emended by Vian, followed by Pompella. In principle there is no reason to deny the adv. to Q. Although it occurs otherwise only 1x in late prose (see LSJ s.v.) and in the Christian epyllion *The Vision of Dorotheus* 209 (see introd. A), it is only a slight innovation in relation to H. ἐσσυμένως, which Q. uses frequently. Thus each case must be considered on its merits, and here the adv. meaning 'rapidly' would be appropriate.

93 ἔπλετο is a weak enjambment, like ἔσκον 78.

93 ἀμφὶς ἄνακτα/ ~ 14.130 Τήλεφον ἀ. ἄ., but in a different *sedes* and meaning 'concerning'; ~ Λ 634, 748 ἀμφὶς ἕκαστον/. Moschus' use of ἀμφίς 2.116, noted above, is adv.

94 ἀπειρέσιον κεχάροντο/ = 12.121, ~ 11.385-6 Q.'s use of adv. ἀ. 12x may be an innovation; it reflects his excessive use of the adj. (see 11n.).

95 σαίνοντες βασιλῆα applies to dolphins the verb used properly of welcoming dogs.

95 ἁλὸς οἶδμα is a formula possibly coined by Q., used 7x with slight variations; early-epic precedents are οἶδμ' ἅλιον *H. h. Apoll.* 417, ἁλμυρὸν ο. θαλάσσης *H. h. Dem.* 14.

97-101

The last three lines (99-101), stating that the whole shield is encircled by the stream of Ocean placed on its rim, are essentially a more elaborate version of Σ 607-8, the conclusion of the H. Shield: **99 βαθὺς ῥόος Ὠκεανοῖο** ~ Σ 607 μέγα σθένος Ὠ.; **100 ἔκτοσθε κατ' ἄντυγος** ~ Σ 608 ἄντυγα παρ πυμάτην; **101 ἀσπὶς ἐνεστήρικτο** ~ Σ 608 σάκεος πύκα ποιητοῖο. There may also be a conscious reflection of the corresponding statement at *Scut.* 314-5, esp. πᾶν δὲ συνεῖχε σάκος πολυδαίδαλον. But the preceding statement (97-98) that there were many other scenes on the shield departs pointedly from the H. model. As noted above (on 1-120), a statement to the same effect concludes the equally long description of the scenes on the shield of Eurypylus, 6.292-3. The description of portents on the eve of Troy's destruction also ends similarly, 12.519-20 μάλα μυρία δ'... It is difficult to reject the judgement of Kakridis (56-57) that these attempts to suggest something more impressive are an artistic weakness. Inclusion in the present case of the name of the maker Hephaestus echoes the same at the opening (4), a touch of ring composition that contributes to a sense of closure. The same is true of the statement about Ocean, because it is anticipated by that at 14. Closure is also suggested by the repetition of **πάντα...πᾶσα...πάντα 99-101**, the final δαίδαλα πάντα also echoing πάντῃ/δ. 3-4.

The MSS.' **τεχνηέντως 97** is cogently defended by Vian against Koechly's -α on the ground that κεῖτο with ὑπ' plus dat. has the force of a passive verb (ἐτέθη); it is a *hapax* in H. (ε270), A. R. (1.561) and Q., in the same *sedes*.

98 πυκινόφρονος 'Ηφαίστοιο/ ~ πολύφρονος 'Η./ θ297,327; ~ 'Η. περίφρονος 1.550, 11.93. Q. also uses εὔφρων as an epithet of Hephaestus, avoiding H. πολύφρων; πυκινόφρων is not H., but occurs in early epic.

99 Πάντα δ' ἄρ' ἐστεφάνωτο was emended by Platt to πάντη δ'... to avoid the anomaly of ἐ., Q.'s only use of the verb, plus acc. = 'encircled'. στεφανόω occurs in H. only as a perf. or pluperf. pass. either intrans. or pass. in meaning. A. R.'s only use, 3.1214 πέριξ δέ μιν ἐστεφάνωντο, is ambiguous, because μιν can be governed either by the verb or by πέριξ, which may reflect ambiguity in κ195 τὴν πέρι πόντος ἐστεφάνωται, where adv. περὶ is possible. Thus in the present passage the rare usage should not be emended.

99 βαθὺς ῥόος 'Ωκεανοῖο ~ 'Ω. βαθὺν ῥόον 1.119, 4.62; for similar H. formulae see 14n.

In **κατ' ἄντυγος 100** the prep. does not differ in meaning from its use with acc. 97; see 28n. Chiasmus in the relative clause 100-1 is emphasised by πᾶσα and πάντα at the line ends.

101 ἐνεστήρικτο = Φ168, a *hapax* in H. and Q.

101 δέδεντο is Rhodomann's palmary emendation of δέδυντο, being a H. form and virtually a synonym of the preceding verb.

102-120

The rest of Achilles' armour is described. On the helmet Zeus is shown supported by the other gods against the rebelling Titans (102-5), who are overwhelmed and burnt alive by Zeus' thunderbolts (106-9). The huge corslet and greaves were the right size and weight for Achilles (110-3). The sword gleams with its baldric of gold, scabbard of silver and handle of ivory (114-7). The great spear from Pelion still reeks of Hector's blood (118-20).

The much larger scale of the description than that which follows the H. Shield (Σ610-3), nineteen lines as opposed to four, has been noted above (on 1-120). There is no similarity of detail to the H. description beyond the fact that the first three items - helmet, corslet, greaves - are the only ones described by H., though not in the same order, and that in both cases prominence is given to the helmet. There is no spear in H. because that did not have to be replaced by Hephaestus, but the absence of a sword is not explained. The corresponding description in the pseudo-Hesiodic *Scutum* (122-38) is just two lines shorter than Q.'s, but differs in being placed immediately before the shield description and in being partly modelled on the typical arming scenes of the *Iliad* (Γ330-8, Λ17-45, Π131-44, Τ369-91). Those scenes have six items in the invariable order of greaves, corslet, sword, shield, helmet and spear, which seems to be a tradition based on

practical considerations. The *Scutum* begins with greaves, corslet and sword, but then replaces the shield with quiver and arrows, which are peculiar to Heracles and given prominence, and then reverses the order of helmet and spear. Q. departs from the order of the H. arming scenes, except that the corslet is second and spear last, and avoids their formulaic element. The only such scene elsewhere in the narrative is the arming of Neoptolemus 7.445-51, which like the present description begins with helmet and ends with spear, but its other contents are unknown because there is a lacuna of indeterminate length at 450. In the present passage the outstandingly elaborate Titanomachy (103-9) shows little influence from its Hesiodic counterparts (*Th.* 664-720, and Typhoeus versus Zeus 820-68). Vian notes the near certainty of influence from the popularity of Gigantomachy scenes in figurative art, beginning with that of Phidias on the shield of his chryselephantine statue of Athena. For other representations see *LIMC* s.v. Gigantes.

The description as a whole is emphatically articulated by the echoing of the initial **Τῇ δ' ἄρα παρκατέκειτο 102** with **Τοῖς δὲ παρεκτετάνυστο 118** for the last item, and by introduction of the intervening items with **'Αμφὶ δὲ 110, δ' 112** and **'Αγχόθι δ' 114**.

102 παρκατέκειτο ~ παρκατέλεκτο I565, 664 in the same *sedes*. The compound occurs only in prose; cf. παρκατέθαψαν 1.804, which may be Q.'s coinage.

102 βεβριθυῖα/ = Φ385, 6.381; its application to κόρυς may allude to Σ611 κόρυθα βριαρήν.

103 ἀμφετέτυκτο = 14, see n. *ad loc.*; here it repeats the metrical pattern of the preceding verb.

103 μέγ' ἀσχαλόωντι ἐοικὼς calls attention to lifelikeness, as does αἰθομένοισιν ἐοικότες 109 at the end of the scene, whereas νιφάδεσσιν ἐοικότες 107 is an internal comparison. Adv. μέγ' (here rather weak after μέγα 102) followed by a form of the H. verb ἀσχαλάω is not a H. combination, but occurs 10x in Q., no fewer than 6x in book 5.

Vian makes the attractive suggestion that Zeus' position, indicated by **οὐρανῷ ἐμβεβαὼς 104**, corresponds with placement at the crown of the helmet. The rhyme of -ώς -ὼς in successive phrases seems accidental.

The pres. middle **ἐριδαινομένων 105**, which occurs only here, may be a slight innovation, but cf. ἐριδήσασθαι Ψ792.

105 συμμογέοντες is read by MS. P, συμμεμαῶτες by H, which presents an interesting problem. Whilst both give appropriate meaning, the latter compound is unique, the only analogous form being ἐμμεμαώς, used by H. and Q.; the former occurs only once otherwise, Oppian, *Hal.* 5.567, and the only other compound of μογέω is the *hapax* ἐμμογέω. In favour of Vian's preference, which is shared by Zimmermann and Pompella, is the fact that it is a synonym of συμπονέοντες and therefore appropriate with πονέοντο 104.

106 κρατερὸν πῦρ ἄμπεχεν = 10.460; ~ πυρὸς κ. μένος λ220, κρατεροῖο π. μ. 5.637. Vian consistently restores the more correct ἀμπ- in this verb 22x where the MSS. have the later form ἀμφ-, whilst ἀμπ- is given by the MSS. 5x. This has been questioned by H. Erbse (*Gnomon* 43 [1971] 566-7) and M. L. West (*Philol.* 130 [1986] 145), and clearly there is doubt as regards Q.'s practice. Against West's conjecture ἄμφεπεν (*ibid.*), from Hesiod, *Th.* 696-7 τοὺς δ' ἄμφεπε θερμὸς ἀυτμὴ / Τιτῆνας, it should be noted that Hesiodic influence is not otherwise apparent in this passage; his case is not helped by the alleged need to emend at 10.460 in the same way.

106-7 ἐκ δὲ κεραυνοὶ/...ἐξεχέοντο = 12.198-9, but with the verb in a different *sedes*. There ἐκ is a generally accepted emendation, which Campbell supports with the present passage, citing other cases of such anticipation of the preverb.

107 νιφάδεσσιν ἐοικότες = 9.71, where the comparison is elaborated, αἵ τε φέρονται / ταρφέες ἐκ νεφέων, which indicates the probable cause of the MSS.' reading in the present passage, νεφέεσσιν, convincingly emended by Pierson. Both passages were influenced by T356-9 ἐχέοντο...ὡς δ' ὅτε ταρφειαὶ νιφάδες...ὣς τότε τ. κόρυθες - cf. κόρυς 102.

The emphatically placed **οὐρανόθεν 108** recalls the indication of Zeus' position at 104.

108 ἀάσπετον...κάρτος = 6.370, 8.428; in these passages all MSS. read ἄσπετον against the metre. ἀάσπ. is found only in Q., but occurs no fewer than 19x. It was coined as an alternative to ἄσπ. on the analogy of ἄσχετος and ἀάσχετος, which are both used by H. and Q. (e.g. ἄσχ. 141 followed by ἀάσχ. 144).

109 αἰθομένοισιν ἐοικότες does not qualify the literal force of αἰθ. but reminds us that it is an artistic representation. **109 ἀμπνείεσκον** = A. R. 3.231 in the description of the fire-breathing bulls, which may have influenced Q., although there the verb is used differently, = 'breathed out', with πυρὸς δεινὸν σέλας as object. Here it is intrans., and taken with ἔτ' means virtually 'were still alive'.

110 θώρηκος γύαλον is Q.'s only use of the H. formula (4x); the addition of descriptive elaboration is not H.

The emphatically placed **πολλὸν 110** is the reading of MS. P, whilst H has καλὸν and a certain choice is not possible, although Vian rightly notes that emphasis on size rather than beauty is more in keeping with the rest of the description, especially with πελώριαι 112.

111 ἄρρηκτον...Πηλείωνα ~ N360 ἄρρηκτόν τ' ἄλυτόν τε, τὸ πολλῶν γούνατ' ἔλυσεν, of the metaphorical rope of strife. βριαρός in H. is always (7x) an epithet of helmets and so used by Q. 4x. Its combination with ἄρρηκτον is repeated 14.453, of the aegis.

111 χάνδανε, 'held, had the capacity for', makes the same point as is made about the corslet by Γ333 ἥρμοσε δ' αὐτῷ, in the arming of Paris. For **ἤσκηντο 112** see 6n.
For the application of **πελώριαι 112** cf. that to τεύχεα Κ439 and esp. 7.448, where with reference to the putting on of Achilles' armour by Neoptolemus the same contrast is made as here, 7.446-8 ἀμφὶ δ' ἐλαφρὰ/...καίπερ ἐόνθ' ἑτέροισι π. **112 ἀμφί**, in contrast to its use at 110, governs the following dat.
The second syllable of **ἔσαν 113** counts as long in the second *princeps* though followed by a vowel and no punctuation. This contradicts the observation of M. L. West (*Greek Metre* 179) that "the licence by which final syllables of the type -ον stand in the *princeps* before a vowel...in Quintus occurs only at the caesura with the support of punctuation," of which 524 contains an example. The present case is recorded by G. Hermann (*Orphica* 713) and explained by the fact that a proper name follows, but his alleged H. parallel, H206, is different because of punctuation. The anomaly remains unexplained.
The contrast between **στιβαραί 113** and ἐλαφραὶ is natural in view of the former's associations: cf. the H. formula (5x) βριθὺ μέγα στιβαρόν, applied to spears.

The sword (**114-7**) is exceptional in this description in the specification of its materials and in the emphasis on brightness - **περιμαρμαίρεσκε** and **παμφανόωσα** at the first and last line ends. The golden baldric and silver scabbard are taken from the H. description of Agamemnon's sword (Λ 30-31), and the ivory handle, with verbal similarity, from that of Penelope's storeroom key, φ 7 κώπη δ' ἐλέφαντος ἐπῆεν.
The assonance in **Ἀγχόθι...ἄδην 114** is perhaps intentional. In the possibly novel combination ἄσχετον ἄορ the noun's first syllable is long, as is mostly the case with the disyllabic form in Q. (9x out of 10), against H. practice (see LSJ s.v.).
114 περιμαρμαίρεσκε ~ 3-4 Ἀμφὶ...μαρμαίρεσκεν; see 4n. for μ. This unique compound possibly has an epic precedent in ἀναμ. A. R. 3.1300, but the text is doubtful.
For **κεκασμένον 115** see 78n.
116 ἀρηρεμένη, 'fitted'. This perf. pass. participle of ἀραρίσκω occurs 11x in Q., but always (except 14.475) spelt -ραμ- in the MSS. (see Vian and Battegay s.v.), which is a late form noted by LSJ, so that Vian's consistent emendation to -ρεμ- is questionable.
Further variety is achieved with the last item of armour, the spear (118-20), by reference to its place of origin and to its use in the killing of Hector, the achievement of Achilles that led directly to his own death. This closely reflects the H. description of the same spear Π 143-4 (=Τ 390-1):

> Πηλιάδα μελίην, τὴν πατρὶ φίλῳ πόρε Χείρων
> Πηλίου ἐκ κορυφῆς, φόνον ἔμμεναι ἡρώεσσιν.

As in H., **Πηλιὰς 119** is in apposition to ἔγχος (118, Π140, Τ387), but Q. innovates in making it a noun, as also 8.200 in the same *sedes*, shortly after the statement γενεὴ δέ οἱ ἐν κορυφῇσι / Πηλίου αἰπεινοῖο 8.160-1. Hesychius records that Πηλιάς as a noun also denotes any spear.

118 παρεκτετάνυστο = 3.337, though in a different *sedes*. The compound was possibly coined by Q. as a poetic equivalent of παρεκτείνω; he has no other compound with παρεκ(ξ)-, though the type was well established in epic. As noted above, the verb is used here as a contrived echo of παρκατέκειτο 102.

118 ὄβριμον ἔγχος occurs 13x in H. at the line end, only 1x elsewhere in Q. (2.258), 2x in a different *sedes*.

119 ὑψικόμοισιν ἐειδομένη ἐλάτῃσι ~ Ε560 ἐλ. ἐοικότες ὑψηλῇσιν; ~ Ξ398, ι186 δρυσὶν ὑ., which Q. also reflects with ὑψικόμοιο...δρυός 1.618. The present adj.-noun combination occurs in Euripides, *Alc.* 585-6. In addition to its primary function as an indication of size, the comparison with pines appropriately conjures up the image of Mount Pelion.

120 ἔτι πνείουσα is a palmary emendation of MSS.' ἐπιπ.: cf. 6.164 ἔτι πνείοντας plus gen., and esp. 7.451 ἔθ' αἵματος ἰσχανόωσαν, probably of the same spear (a lacuna precedes); also here there may be intended similarity to 109 ἔτ'...ἀμπνείεσκον.

120 λύθρου...καὶ αἵματος ~ the H. formula (3x) αἵματι καὶ λύθρῳ; Q. otherwise avoids this combination of nouns.

121-179: Introduction to the Contest

Thetis announces to the Greeks that she will award the armour of Achilles to the one who rescued his body and is "the best" (121-7). Odysseus and Telamonian Ajax stand up as rival claimants, Ajax being said to exceed all other Greeks no less than the evening star outshines other stars (128-33). Ajax appeals to Idomeneus, Nestor and Agamemnon, in whose knowledge and wisdom both he and Odysseus have confidence (134-8). Nestor takes Idomeneus and Agamemnon aside and advises as follows (139-40): "The gods are bringing trouble for the Greeks with the impending conflict between Ajax and Odysseus (141-4). The winner will rejoice, but the loser will blame the Greeks, especially the three of them, no longer supporting them in battle, and the anger of one of these outstanding leaders will cause great harm (145-51). I claim the right to advise in view of my greater age and experience, because knowledgeable old age carries greater weight in deliberation (152-6). They should let the Trojans decide which of the two is most feared by the enemy and which one rescued Achilles' body (157-60). Their many Trojan prisoners will judge fairly and without favour, since all the Greeks are hated by them" (160-4). Agamemnon applauds the wisdom of Nestor's claim that the loser will be angry with the Greeks, and his assessment of these two as the best (165-70). He agrees that they should

entrust judgement to the Trojans, so that blame will attach only to them (171-4). They publicly decline to judge, and the Trojans, in spite of being prisoners, adjudicate the dispute (175-9).

The above is Q.'s distinctive blending of the traditional versions of the story. It is consistent with the only H. mention of it, Odysseus' recollection of his victory over Ajax λ 545-7, apart from the role of Athena:

> τήν μιν ἐγὼ νίκησα δικαζόμενος παρὰ νηυσὶν
> τεύχεσιν ἀμφ' Ἀχιλῆος· ἔθηκε δὲ πότνια μήτηρ.
> παῖδες δὲ Τρώων δίκασαν καὶ Παλλὰς Ἀθήνη.

The scholium HQV on the last line is as follows:

> φυλαττόμενος ὁ Ἀγαμέμνων τὸ δόξαι θατέρῳ χαρίζεσθαι... αἰχμαλώτους τῶν Τρώων ἀγαγὼν ἠρώτησεν ὑπὸ ὁποτέρου τῶν ἡρώων μᾶλλον ἐλυπήθησαν, εἰπόντων δὲ τὸν Ὀδυσσέα τῶν αἰχμαλώτων, δηλαδὴ ἐκεῖνον εἶναι τὸν ἄριστον κρίναντες τὸν πλεῖστα λυπήσαντα τοὺς ἐχθρούς, ἔδωκεν εὐθὺς τῷ Ὀδυσσεῖ τὰ ὅπλα.

Though not beyond dispute, this is generally assumed to be the version of the *Aethiopis*. Q. follows it closely with ἄριστος Ἀχαιῶν 125 and ὅν τινα δήιοι ἄνδρες ὑποτρομέουσι μάλιστα 158a, but departs from it pointedly with the displacement of Agamemnon's initiative by that of Nestor. On that point he seems to be influenced by the version of the *Little Iliad* (frag. 2A Davies = schol. on Aristophanes, *Equ.* 1056), whilst differing from it on others. According to that, on Nestor's advice Greek spies were sent to the walls of Troy, who overheard Trojan women arguing about the bravery of the two rivals. One claimed that Ajax was superior because he carried Achilles' body from the battle, and then another, prompted by Athena, objected that carrying was a woman's work, but only a man could fight. This would also explain why Q. links being the best with the rescue of Achilles' body. But the initial reference of the dispute to the trio Nestor, Agamemnon and Idomeneus is not found in any other source and may well be Q.'s innovation, reflecting as it does the general importance he accords to Idomeneus (thus Vian, II 10 n.1). A much more significant departure, however, is that the Trojans are not just consulted, but act as judges in a formal trial with speeches on both sides. This in part reflects the third traditional variant of the story, according to which the Greeks heard the disputants and decided by secret ballot. That is reflected by Pindar (*Nem.* 8.26f.) and Sophocles (*Ajax* 1135-7), as well as by the elaborate rhetorical renderings of the story by Antisthenes (*Ajax* and *Od.*) and Ovid (*Met.* 12.626-8 and 13 *passim*); it is also found in the earliest pictorial evidence (see Vian, II 8 n.1 and *LIMC* s.v. Ajax *XXIII-XXV*). In essence Q. has combined this with the traditional role of the Trojan prisoners for his own highly rhetorical rendering (noted by Eustathius on λ546). He seems to show awareness of the resultant novelty, not to say anomaly, of the

Trojans' role — δορύκτητοί περ ἐόντες 178. Possibly he regarded this as implied by the H. use of δικαζόμενος and δίκασαν λ545 and 547, since he reflects it with δικάσσαι 157, δικασπολίην 172 and 176, and esp. Τρώιοι υἷες...δικάσαντ' 318 at the conclusion of the episode. Finally, Q.'s omission of Athena contrary to the *Odyssey* and the *Little Iliad* need be no more than symptomatic of his general reduction of divine intervention (see introd. C); she is first mentioned in this episode at 360 as the cause of Ajax's madness. Keydell's suggestion that Q. could not have managed such a complication at this point (*RE* 1280) can be disregarded.

121-127

After the ecphrasis the narrative is resumed at the point reached in the opening lines of the book, with 121-2 recalling 2-3 and 123-4 being a more elaborate restatement of 1; see 1 n.

121 Θέτις κυανοκρήδεμνος/ = 4.115 and 381. The repetition is noteworthy partly because the epithet κ. is probably coined by Q. on the model of H. καλλι- and λιπαροκρήδεμνος, neither used by Q. Clearly κυανο- indicates mourning, its most obvious inspiration being Ω 93-94 κάλυμμ' ἕλε δῖα θεάων / κυάνεον, τοῦ δ' οὔτι μελάντερον ἔπλετο ἔσθος, of Thetis mourning in anticipation of Achilles' death. But also relevant is κυανοχαίτης H. epithet of Poseidon, which is not used by Q. but of which he has the synonym κυανοπλόκαμος applied 345 to the Nereids.

122 /θεσπέσιον φάτο μῦθον ~ /θαρσαλέον φ. μ. 1.407, 8.14; φ. μ. alone is used 3.632 in the same *sedes*, but otherwise 8x at the line end, as it is in H. (10x). Both here and at 117 θ. may mean either 'belonging to a deity' or 'remarkable'; the repetition weakens its impact here.

123 κατ' ἀγῶνος is Rhodomann's emendation of MSS.' καὶ ἀ., which is retained by Pompella but requires ἀ. to mean 'competition', incompatible with ἀέθλια in the same sense; ἀέ. ...τελέσθη = 1 ἀπηνύσθησαν ἄεθλοι (see n. *ad loc.*). An indication of place is needed; for the use of κατά see 27-8n.

123-4 ἀέθλια...ὅσσ'...κατέθηκα must mean "the contests I arranged" (thus Combellack), like 4.104 περικαλλέα θεῖναι ἄεθλα. The unusual sense of the verb κ. arises from Q.'s reflection of ω91 οἷ' ἐπὶ σοὶ κατέθηκε θεὰ περικαλλέ' ἄεθλα, where ἄ. = 'contests', as opposed to 'prizes' ω85 in a similar expression.

124 ἐπὶ...ἀχνυμένη is Thetis' own more elaborate expression of the narrative's ἀκηχεμένη Ἀχιλῆος 122.

The basis of the award is stated **125** with laconic brevity, which highlights the following emphasis on the splendour of the prize.

125 /ἀλλ' ἴτω ~ H75 /δεῦρ' ἴ., α276 /ἂψ ἴ.

The **καὶ 125** that links rescuing the body with being the best Greek is ambiguous, implying either "thus proved himself" or "is in general". The

latter is confirmed at 158a-160, where "being feared most by the enemy", which is equivalent to being the best, is stated first.

125 ἄριστος Ἀχαιῶν, used only here by Q., is a traditional expression, 3x in H., and Ἀ. ὅστις ἄ. 5x in H.

126 κέ οἱ is Koechly's emendation of κέν οἱ and is supported by the fact that digamma in οἱ is mostly, though not always, observed by Q. (Vian, *Rech.* 154-5). κε(ν) plus fut. indic., here δώσω, occurs in H., indicating limitation or condition (Monro, *GHD* 326.1), and in Q. also 4.490-1, 6.79-80, 10.228.

For **ἄμβροτα τεύχε' (-α) 126** in Q. and for his use of the form τεύχη, which is read by all but one MS. here, see 2n. The unique addition of θνητά gives special emphasis.

127 μέγ' εὔαδεν is Struve's emendation of μετεύαδεν; for the corruption cf. 41. μέτ' would be possible, but εὔαδε (-ον) plus dat. is used 8x elsewhere by Q.; cf. esp. 2.78 μάλ' εὔαδεν in the same *sedes*. Repetition of μέγ' after 124 underlines the contrasted meanings of εὔαδεν and ἀχνυμένη 124; cf. μέγα πάντας 130 and μ. πᾶσι132.

128-138

Odysseus and Ajax respond to Thetis' offer with rival claims. Ajax's superiority over the Greeks in general is likened to the superior brightness of the evening star. His appeal to Idomeneus, Nestor and Agamemnon is supported by Odysseus. The initial statements of claim are simply mentioned 128 without any hint of their nature, which avoids anticipation and possible weakening of the impact of the following speeches. Also avoided is any indication that the two are in imminent danger of coming to blows, which seems to have featured in at least some early versions. It is only in his speech 229-34 that Ajax proposes a regular contest of strength. This is in keeping with Q.'s consistent tendency to avoid anything that would lower the dignity of his heroes. But the most remarkable feature of this passage is its unashamed prejudice in favour of Ajax in the elaborate statement of his pre-eminence, which must be understood as reflecting his consistent presentation in the earlier narrative. That begins 1.494 ff. with his initiative, supported by Achilles, in relieving the Greeks hard pressed by Penthesilea. With Achilles' death 3.217 ff. the main responsibility for defending his body is assumed by Ajax, and among the enemy Glaucus acknowledges 3.246-9 his status next to Achilles. Finally, in the funeral games twice he is unrivalled: 4.436-64 he alone can throw the great discus of Antaeus and so is awarded the armour of Memnon, which he alone can wear (an important foreshadowing of Ajax's argument 5.224-8); 4.479-99 no-one takes up his challenge to the pancratium, and Euryalus acknowledges his superiority. This simple one-sided characterisation of Ajax as a paragon of heroic virtue (thus M. W. Mansur, *The Treatment of Homeric Characters by Quintus of Smyrna* 13-15) is consistent with his status in H. (e.g. B768-9, λ556-8) and with his representation by some later authors (esp. Pindar, *Nem.* 8). But in Sophocles' *Ajax* care is taken to bring out darker sides to

his character, notably arrogance towards the gods (cf. 118-32, 766-77 and see W. B. Stanford, ed. 1963, introd.), and so it is the more surprising that Q. does not heed Aristotle's view that the downfall of purely good men is not so much tragic as repulsive (*Poet.* 1452b 34-36).
128 ἐριδμαίνοντ' ἐπέεσσιν ~ Β 342 ἐπέεσσ' ἐριδαίνομεν. ἐριδμ. occurs 1x in H., but in the trans. sense 'provoke'; its first intrans. use is in A. R. (1x). Q. uses it 9x, always intrans.; cf. esp. 229 μύθοισιν ἐριδμαίνοντε in Ajax's speech. The combination of dual participle with pl. verb is common in epic (see Monro, *GHD* 173.2).
129 /υἱὸς Λαέρταο = χ 191, 5x in Q.
Enjambment of **ἀντιθέου.../Αἴας 129-30** and the epithet with T. give greater weight to the second name and lead into the statement of superiority. υἱὸς is understood after καὶ; ~ Ρ 284 υἱὸς Τ. ἀγαυοῦ φαίδιμος Αἴας, and below 482, 580 πάις ἐσθλὸς ἐυσθενέος Τ.
The echo of **ὃς μέγα πάντας 130** with **ὃς μ. πᾶσι 132** in the simile underlines the notion of analogous preeminence.
130 πάντας ὑπείρεχεν = 7.368, ~ 4.167. Cf. Γ 210 ὑ. in the same *sedes*, but in an intrans., physical sense; ὑπερέχω trans. = 'surpass' appears first in tragedy, e.g. Euripides, *Hipp.* 1365 πάντας ὑπερσχών (cf. περρέχοισα in a comparable simile in Sappho fr. 96.9).
The simile of the evening star **131-2** is closely modelled on that at Χ 317-8, applied to Achilles' spear:

> οἷος δ' ἀστὴρ εἶσι μετ' ἄστρασι νυκτὸς ἀμολγῷ
> Ἕσπερος, ὃς κάλλιστος ἐν οὐρανῷ ἵσταται ἀστήρ.

Most notable among the verbal echoes is Ἕ. in the same *sedes*. But **132 παμφαίνῃσι** is taken from the star simile Ε 5-6.
ἀρίδηλος 131 is post-H., but preferred by Q. (7x) to H. ἀρίζηλος (1x).
131 οὐρανὸν αἰγλήεντα/ ~ H. ο. ἀστερόεντα/ and αἰγλήεντος Ὀλύμπου/; other forms of the present combination occur 3x in Q.
133 /τῷ εἰκὼς at the resumption of the narrative = Φ 254, ~ below 370 and Δ 78 after a star simile. The focus of the present simile, preeminence, is the same as that of Q.'s moon and stars simile 1.36-41: **130 μέγα πάντας ὑπείρεχεν** ~ 1.36 πασάων μέγ' ὑ. The star similes in H. and A. R. are all different in focusing on physical brightness or beauty.
134 Ἤιτεε, with personal objects = 'asked for', gives incomplete meaning; one requires 'as something' or 'to do something'. Thus Koechly supposes a line lost after 134 amounting to "to decide the dispute for them." Vian attributes to the verb, used only here by Q., the otherwise unattested meaning of 'appeal to'. Another solution, suggested by Koechly, is to emend Ἰδομενῆα κλυτὸν (variant -ῆ' αὐτὸν) to Ἰ. κριτὴν, "asked for... as judge", which is in fact Combellack's translation. But κριτής is a non-epic word and is not used elsewhere by Q. It is better to accept an ellipsis of

meaning with Ἤιτεε, perhaps arising from the story's assumed familiarity, than to attribute a unique sense to the verb or to accept a hazardous emendation.

135 μητιόωντ' Ἀγαμέμνονα is doubly novel: first, the participle in -όων as an adj. = 'wise', synonym of H. μητιόεις and -ετα, is possibly Q.'s innovation (see Vian, *Rech.* 156); secondly, the epithet is not traditional or obvious for Agamemnon. The accus. Ἀγ. occurs in H. only with Ἀτρεΐδην, δῖον (1x in Q.) or ποιμένα λαῶν. Q.'s other applications of μ., all in book 5, reflect traditional characterisation - 338 to Prometheus, 429 and 571 to Odysseus. The present application is contextually determined, indicating Agamemnon's expected role, appropriate for the climactic placing of his name. But the expectation that he will take the lead is immediately belied by his deference to Nestor, which reflects their H. characterisation as well as one version of this story (see above on 121-179).

For **ἴδμεναι ἀτρεκέως 136** see Campbell on 12.579.

136 ἐρικυδέος ἔργα μόθοιο is taken by Vian as a general reference to warfare, but by Combellack as referring to Ajax's achievements in particular. Q. has three similar expressions: 2.166 δυσηχέος ἔ. μ., 6.18 ἀμήχανα ἔ. μ., 13.321 οὐλομένου...ἔ. μ. Since in those cases ἔργα is merely periphrastic, one may assume that the same is true here and that the reference is general.

137 ἐπὶ...πεποίθει is read by all MSS. but E, which has ἔπι...π. The latter would link ἔπι with κείνοις, but πείθομαι plus ἐπὶ and dat. is found only in late prose, whilst tmesis of ἐπιπείθομαι is common epic usage.

The two positive adjs. qualified by **ἐν Δαναοῖσι 138** have virtually the force of superlatives; cf. 130.

139-64

The rhetorical character of Q.'s rendering of this episode (noted above on 121-79) first becomes apparent with Nestor's speech, which is a powerful and well constructed protreptic utterance. Vian (I xxxix n.7) records it is an example of deliberative or forensic oratory. It may be analysed as follows: 141-4 presentation of the problem - the impending quarrel; 145-51 explanation of the problem - the anger of the loser and the loss of his support; 152-6 anticipatory justification of the advice - the speaker's age and experience; 157-60 the advice - refer judgement to the Trojans; 160-4 argument in support of the advice - the availability and impartiality of the Trojan prisoners. All parts are of about the same length, four to five lines, except the second, the explanation, which is appropriately longer with seven lines. The weight of this explanation as a contribution to the argument depends on its pointed allusion, albeit unspoken, to the anger (note χόλος 150) of Achilles and its disastrous consequences.

In **Ἀτρέος υἱέι δίῳ 139** δ. is an unusual addition, the more noticeable after Νηλέος υἷα 134. H. only elaborates Ἀ. υ. with Ἀρήιος as first word; other variants in Q. are Ἀ. ὄβριμοι υἷες, Ἀ. υἷε καταιώ.

140 ἐελδομένοισιν can only naturally be understood as desire to hear what Nestor had to say and so to anticipate agreement. Vian translates thus, but Combellack wrongly "eager to act as judges." Similar to the whole statement is A. R. 1.350.

141-2 ἦ μέγα...Οὐρανίωνες suggests conscious reflection of both ω547 αὐτὰρ ἐπεί τοι πῆμα τόδ' ἤγαγον Ο. and also ω526 αὐτοὶ δέ τ' ἀκηδέες εἰσίν, said of the gods in contrast to mortals. By bringing these elements together Q. creates a pathetic polarity.

The two names in **143** are provided with characteristic epithets, emphasised by chiasmus. **Αἴαντος μεγάλοιο** (**-ου**) occurs 5x in Q.; it is not H., but cf. H. A. μεγαθύμου and A. μεγαλήτορος, neither used by Q. **περιφραδέος τ' Ὀδυσῆος** π. is H. only as the adv. -ως (1x in Q.); rare as an adj., it occurs first *H. h. Herm.* 464. It is chosen here as approx. equivalent to the H. epithets of Odysseus πολύμητις, -μήχανος, -τροπος, -φρων, ποικιλομήτης, none of which is used by Q. Q. also departs from H. in applying to Odysseus δολόμητις, δολόεις, εὔφρων, περίφρων, πινυτόφρων, κερδαλέος, μητιόων, πυκιμήδης. This illustrates Q.'s remarkable care and inventiveness in such matters.

The weakness of **ἀάσχετον 144** after ἄσχετον 141 exemplifies Q.'s lack of care about such repetition, which he may well have regarded as appropriate for the H. manner, as opposed to the fastidiousness of the Alexandrians.

145 γάρ θ' is read by all MSS. but emended by Koechly to γάρ ῥ', as also 4.532, on the ground that γάρ τε is avoided by Q., but in fact it occurs 3x or 4x, as opposed to γάρ ῥα 11x or 12x. Both combinations are equally common in H.

146 μέγα πένθος ἀέξει/ ~ Ρ139 μ. π. ἐνὶ στήθεσσιν ἀέξων/ *et sim.* in H., 1.116 π. ἀέξει/ *et sim.* in Q. The present context shows that ἀέξει is fut. in meaning. In early epic and Q. ἀέξω occurs only in pres. and imperf. forms, whilst A. R. has fut. ἀεξήσεσθαι 3.837. Therefore ἀέξει here is best regarded as an example of the licence of pres. for fut., noted by Keydell as common in Nonnus, incl. ἀέξω *Dion.* 42.283 (ed. 1959, I 70*); cf. the so-called prophetic pres.

147 πάντας ἀτεμβόμενος Both here and 173 ἀ. plus acc. = 'blame', a meaning which the middle of the verb has first in A. R., 2x plus dat. and 2x absolutely. Q. modifies this non-H. use with acc. of personal object on the analogy of the synonym μέμφομαι plus dat. or acc.; see Campbell on A. R. 3.99 (comm. 1994).

148 τὸ πάροιθε/ is noted by A. Svensson (*Der Gebrauch des bestimmten Artikels in der nachklassischen griech. Epik* 87) as one of eight occurrences in Q. at the line end, where it is never found in H. In general τὸ π. is much more favoured by Q. (25x) than by H. (3x).

149 Μέγα...'Αχαιοῖς ~ A2 μυρί' 'Αχαιοῖς ἄλγε'; the echo underlines the obvious potential parallel with the anger of Achilles. The statement is virtually the same as that with which Nestor began 141-2.
150 ἦν...χόλος ~ χ. δέ μιν ἄγριος ᾕρει 3x in H., ἥν μιν...λάβῃ χ. 4.493. Nestor's diplomatic statement 150-1 of balanced preeminence in different spheres differs significantly from the poet's statement about Ajax 130.
151 ὃ μὲν...βουλῇ/ ~ B202 οὔτε ποτ' ἐν π. ...οὔτ' ἐνὶ β., Σ252 ὁ μὲν ἂρ μύθοισιν, ὁ δ' ἔγχει πολλὸν ἐνίκα (of Polydamas and Hector).
152 'Αλλ'...γεραίτερός εἰμι is a close reflection of Nestor's words A259 ἀλλὰ πίθεσθ'· ἄμφω δὲ νεωτέρω ἐστὸν ἐμεῖο and 160 ἀλλ' ἄγ' ἐγών, ὅς σεῖο γεραίτερος εὔχομαι εἶναι.
152 ἐμεῖο πίθεσθε The variants ἐμοῖο and πείθεσθε may reflect an attempt to substitute the usual construction of π. plus dat. But π. plus gen., on the analogy of ἀκούω, occurs in Herodotus, possibly 1x in H. (K57 κείνου...πιθοίατο, variant κείνῳ) and A. R. 3.307-8 ἐμεῖο/πείθεσθε. Q. uses it frequently with dat., but 2.59 Vian emends ἐμοὶ πείθ. to ἐμεῖο πίθ. Here the rarer construction is preferable. Koechly's emendation to πείθεσθον and Zimmermann's to -αι to avoid hiatus are unnecessary, because it is admissible at the trochaic caesura in Q. (see Koechly, *prol.* XL, Vian, *Rech.* 215). The occurrence of two amphibrachs before the caesura is noted and defended by Vian, *Rech.* 240.
152 ἐπεί ῥα γεραίτερός εἰμι/ = 4.287 (ᾖεν), both being cases of trochaic caesura in the fourth foot; see Vian, *Rech.* 242-3.
153-4 γήραϊ πολλῷ / καὶ νόον The motive for Van Herwerden's emendation πολλὸν is possibly a better parallel with πολλὰ 154. But Vian notes that it is in any case understood with νόον, whilst γ. πολλῷ is in keeping with the preceding emphasis on much greater age.
154 ἐσθλὰ...μόγησα involves a zeugma, noted by Vian (also *Rech.* 209), which is made easier by the fact that ἄλγεα πολλὰ μόγησα is a H. formula (4x), though unique in Q.
The general observation **Αἰεὶ...οἶδε 155-6** closely reflects Γ108-10, with some verbal approximation. The tautology of πολύιδρις and μάλα μυρία οἶδε is weak; cf. 251-2, in Odysseus' main speech, where αἰεὶ...ἀνὴρ πολύιδρις ἀμείνων is not supported by any similar causal clause. For the association of age with knowledge in similar terms cf. Φ440, β16.
With **Τοὔνεκα 157** cf. οὔνεκα 150 and οὔνεκεν 154; emphasis on logical connections characterises Nestor's argument.
In **Τρωσὶν...ἐύφροσι 157** the epithet is not traditional or ornamental, but determined by the context, i.e. Nestor's wishful thinking. Combellack translates 'intelligent', Vian 'bon jugement'. The same meaning (Vian and Battegay s.v. 'sage', 'avisé') applies to most of Q.'s uses of ἐύφρων (21x) and ἐυφροσύνη (3x), i.e. as synonyms of σώφρων (epic σαόφρων, cf. 2.41-2 σαόφρονι...ἐύφρονα) and -οσύνη, as well as of H. ἐυφρονέων

(4x in Q.), instead of the usual meaning 'happy'. The innovation, possibly Q.'s own, is bold. LSJ wrongly attributes Q.'s meaning of ἐύφρων to Xenophanes 1.13 (see E. Heitsch, ed. 1983, 93); see Vian on 4.130 and Campbell on 12.287.

After **τήνδε δικάσσαι 157** there is no lacuna, as Koechly supposes, but ellipsis of cognate δίκην. One may see the influence of Hesiod, *Op.* 39 οἳ τήνδε δίκην ἐθέλουσι δικάσσαι, and also, for the ellipsis, cf. Θ 579-80 δικάσσω...ἰθεῖα γὰρ ἔσται (sc. δίκη), which prompted Q.'s **δίκην ἰθεῖαν 162**.

The whole phrase **Τρωσὶν...δικάσσαι 157** is a slight adaptation of the Attic legal expression δίκην ἐφιέναι εἴς τινας, "refer a case to a (higher) court"; see LSJ ἐφίημι IV and F. C. Doherty, *Three Private Speeches of Demosthenes* (Oxford 1927) 75. It is a remarkable innovation in epic language, but less surprising in view of Q.'s adherence to legal practice in the following contest.

158 ἀντιθέῳ...'Οδυσῆι For the balance of the two names with laudatory epithets cf. 143, but the pattern is changed from ABBA to ABAB. ἀντίθεος in Q., as in H., is applied indiscriminately to various named individuals; φιλοπτόλεμος is always pl. in H., but sing. in epic before Q.

158a was so numbered by Zimmermann, Vian and Pompella because earlier editors, following most MSS., transposed it to 4.525.

158a-60 ὅν τινα...πολέμοιο For the significance of this as a reformulation of the words of Thetis at 125 and for its bearing on Q.'s use of earlier versions of the story see above on 121-179.

159 νέκυν Πηληιάδαο/= 3.672; gen. Π. occurs 2x in H. and 3x in Q., whilst Πηληιάδεω, commoner in H. (10x), is not used by Q.

160 /ἐξ ὀλοοῦ πολέμοιο= 3.289; ~ 6.338, 9.531, 11.164, Γ133 (the only H. precedent). ὀλοός is used to excess by Q., 78x.

160 δορύκτητοι In Q.'s eight uses of δ. (cf. esp. 172 and 178) MSS. give δορυ-, not δορι-, which is the more correct equivalent of the H. *hapax* δουρικτήτην Ι343.

161 νεοδμήτῳ ὑπ' ἀνάγκῃ, "in newly subjected compulsion", involves a bold transfer of ν. from Τρῶες, as is shown by Q.'s one other use of it, 3.405 of women in the analogous sense 'newly married'. Cf. 13.523 Αἴθρης, ὅσσ' ἐμόγησε δορυκτήτῳ ὑπ' ἀνάγκῃ, where δ. is transferred from A.

162 ἐπὶ σφίσι is intrinsically ambiguous because the pronoun can be either reflexive or demonstrative. If reflexive, it would mean 'between themselves'; cf. 170 ἐ. σ. δηριόωνται. If demonstrative, it refers to Ajax and Odysseus, as it is generally understood; Vian and Battegay classify this use of ἐπί plus dat. as 'au sujet de' (s.v. C3c).

163 ἦρα φέροντες The distinctively H. expression is favoured by Q. (16x), who like H. allows hiatus before it, e.g. 2.650, 3.7.

164 ἄτης clearly has not its usual H. meaning 'mental blindness', but 'disaster', as in the majority of Q.'s uses (at least 5x out of 8) and as 2x in H. (ω480, μ372). κακῆς...ἄ. is a strong expression from Nestor for suffering inflicted by the Greeks.

165-179

Narrative is kept to a minimum and outweighed by Agamemnon's speech of assent, which is constructed as follows: flattery of Nestor (166-7), echoing of his appraisal of the problem (168-70), agreement with the proposed referral of judgement to the Trojans (171-2), and finally the original statement, introduced with an echo of Nestor's ἀτεμβόμενος 147, that the anger of the loser and its consequences will be directed exclusively towards the Trojans (173-4). This last is a false foreshadowing of events, which contributes to the heightening of dramatic tension (thus G. E. Duckworth, "Foreshadowing and Suspense in the *Posthomerica* of Quintus of Smyrna", *AJP* 57 [1936] 74 n.60).

165 Ὣς...Ἀγαμέμνων = 427. Q.'s liking for ὣς φάμενος *et sim.* at the conclusion of speeches (25x, cf. 427, 559) is noted by R. Schau (*De formulis, quas poetae Graeci in conclusione orationis directae posuerunt*, diss. Tilsitt 1890). The combination ὣς φ. πρ. is not H., but a formula possibly created by Q. (15x). ἐυμμελίης is a H. epithet (7x, never of Agamemnon) much favoured by Q. (23x, 7x with nom. Ἀγ.). Otherwise with Ἀγ. Q. avoids the frequent H. ἄναξ ἀνδρῶν and (εὐρὺ) κρείων, using αἰχμητής and δῖος 1x each. For Agamemnon's flattery of Nestor 166-7 cf. esp. B370-4.

166-7 Ὦ...Δαναῶν ~ O569 Ἀντίλοχ', οὔτις σεῖο νεώτερος ἄλλος Ἀχαιῶν. Among similar statements in Q. cf. esp. 574-5 Ὦ φίλοι, ὡς...γίνεται.

167 οὔτ'...παλαιός is a conventional polar expression (cf. Ξ108, α395, θ58) with special point in the present context.

In **φῇς...χαλεπῆναι 168** the aor. infinitive has the force of a fut., which is a H. construction (see Chantraine, *GH.* II 307) employed by Q. 6x elsewhere with φημί (1.517, 4.473-4, 9.6-7, 410-1, 12.110-1, 14.565-7).

168 ἀνηλεγέως χ., 'be recklessly angry' (Combellack), ~ I309 ἀπηλεγέως ἀποειπεῖν. Q. possibly uses H. ἀπ. 1x, 1.226, where the MSS. have τύπτον ἀπ., but editors emend to ἀν. Otherwise Q. uses the adv. ἀν. 6x and the adj. 2.75, prob. following epic precedent: scholia to A. R. 1.785 and 2.17 cite Herodian for adv. ἀν.

169 /ἀνέρα ὅν is emended by Koechly to ἄνδρα τόν to avoid hiatus, but cf. /ἀνέρι ὅν 3.614; Vian (*Rech.* 214) explains both cases in terms of punctuation at the diaeresis.

169-70 θεοὶ...νίκης ~ α234 νῦν δ' ἑτέρως ἐβάλοντο θεοί, where ἐβάλ. is a variant for ἐβόλοντο; there Eustathius (1414.1-10) takes ἑτ. ἐβάλ. as a metaphor from dicing. Q. reflects this 2x with θεοὶ δ' ἑτέρως ἐβάλοντο (1.610, 10.427). However the verb is understood in those

passages, in the present unique development of the expression it means 'place'; Lehrs translates 'postposuerint victoriae'. μετόπισθε...νίκης, 'behind', i.e. 'short of victory', is possibly a novel expression , but it may well be influenced by Sophocles, *Ajax* 1248-9 (see 243-50n.): Agamemnon says with reference to the victory of Odysseus over Ajax,

εἰ τοὺς δίκῃ νικῶντας ἐξωθήσομεν
καὶ τοὺς ὄπισθεν ἐς τὸ πρόσθεν ἄξομεν.

In that context τοὺς ὄπισθεν = τοὺς μὴ νικῶντας or τοὺς νίκης λελειμμένους (cf. *ibid.* 1245 οἱ λελειμμένοι). Here the emphatic enjambment of νίκης underlines the point of the expression.

170 οἱ...δηριόωνται/ ~ Θ78 ὅ τ' ἄριστοι Ἀχαιῶν δηριόωντο/, of Odysseus and Achilles. ἄριστοι with def. article occurs 4x in Q. (also 1.779, 9.487, 12.305) and is H.; see A. Svensson, *op. cit.* 79-80. All MSS. read ἐνὶ σφίσι, emended to ἐπὶ σ. by Koechly and Vian. ἐνὶ can only mean 'among', sc. the Greeks, with σφίσι demonstrative (cf. 2.538), whereas ἐπὶ plus dat. of reflexive σφίσι gives the appropriate meaning 'against one another'. The verb is only used absolutely in H., but plus dat. in later epic and Q., like its synonym μάχομαι. The present use with ἐπί and dat., possibly unique, is analogous to μάχομαι with the same construction in H.

171 ἔνδοθεν ἦτορ ἐνὶ φρεσὶ is a curious combination of ἔ. ἦ., which occurs 1x in H. and 2x elsewhere in Q., and ἦ. ἐ. φ., 2x in H. and not elsewhere in Q. Possibly pleonasm is used for emphasis; thus Vian translates "mon coeur au plus profond de moi." Emphasis here on Agamemnon's own private opinion is seen by Kakridis (59 n.2) as a concession to the version of the scholium to λ547, which gives him the initiative.

171-2 ταῦτα μενοινᾷ/ ὄφρα... The final clause can be taken as epexegetic after ταῦτα (or ταὐτὰ, read by Pompella) rather than directly dependent on the verb of wishing; cf. 1.27-28 τόδε ὁρμαίνεσκεν,/ ὄφρα.... But Keydell (*RE* 1294) regards this and other cases in Q. as substitution of a final clause for an infinitive, reflecting influence of the contemporary language; cf. 2.129, 11.76, 13.546, 14.240.

For **ἀτεμβόμενος 173** see 147n.

173 ὀλέθρια μήσεται ἔργα/ is a necessary emendation of the MSS.' ὀ. μήσατο ἔ.; ~ 10.378 μήδετο λοίγια ἔ., 1.216 μέγα μήδεται ἔργον. Of several H. line ends with μήδετο ἔ. or μήσατο ἔ. the closest is ἀεικέα μ. ἔ. (2x).

174 /Τρωσὶν ἐυπτολέμοισι ~ /Τ. φιλοπτ. 3x in H. and 2x in Q.; ἐ. is notably favoured by Q., used 20x, 6x with forms of Τρ.

174 χόλον...ὀπάσσει The expression is noteworthy because an impersonal object of ὀ. is usually something desirable or neutral, as in 172. But cf. Θ210 θεοὶ δ' ὤπαζον οἰζύν, where ὤ. acquires the sense of

'inflict'; Q. uses the verb similarly at least 6x. Here there seems to be point in its repetition after 172 with contrasted applications.

175 ἕνα θυμὸν ἐνὶ στέρνοισιν Vian translates "dans le secret de leur poitrine un accord unanime", and notes "ἐνὶ στ. s'oppose à ἀμφαδόν." Combellack and Way do not translate ἐνὶ στ., obviously regarding it as an insignificant manner of speech. It is equivalent to the frequent H. formula θυμὸς (-ὸν) ἐνὶ στήθεσσι, which Q. uses 3x, as well as θ. ἐνὶ στέρνοισι 4x. Clearly Q. regarded the present expression as a mere formal variant of the H. formula, and so it is unlikely to have any special point here.

176 ἀμφαδὸν implies announcement to the assembled Greeks and represents slight ellipsis of the narrative.

176 ἐρατεινήν, the reading of all MSS., is defended by Vian against the commonly accepted emendation ἀλεγεινήν (cf. 318 ἔριν δικάσαντ' ἀλεγεινήν). He translates ἐρ. 'amical' and in his note 'à l' amiable'; cf. Pompella's 'amichevole'. No similar use of ἐρ. has been cited, the best support being ἐπήρατος = 'friendly' 4.304 and possibly (conjectured) 4.195. Koechly defends ἐρ. here as = 'gratus', sc. originally 'welcome' to the judges, which is his improbable interpretation of 140 ἄμφω ἐελδομένοισιν. But clearly ἐρ. must = 'welcome', 'desirable', to someone, if it has any meaning appropriate to the context. Such a meaning can only refer to Ajax or Odysseus, on the basis of 134-7; thus Vian and Battegay, "qui convient aux deux parties." Q., however, must be blamed for the fact that this is not immediately clear.

177 Τῶν δ' ἄρ' ἀναινομένων involves further ellipsis of narrative — the summoning and introduction of the Trojans. That would be explicitly indicated by Vian's suggested emendation ἐπιτελλομένων, which, however, is not justifiable. Condensed and rapid narrative at this point allows Q. to focus most attention on the speeches (see 165-179n.). He omits the question put to the Trojans as to who had harmed them the most, clearly because that was incompatible with the following contest of speeches (see 121-179n.).

177 Τρώων ἐρικυδέες υἷες/ ~ the H. periphrasis (Ἀρήιοι) υἷες Ἀχαιῶν/, which Q. uses 2x plus variations. There is no H. equivalent for the Trojans apart from the unique παῖδες...Τρώων λ547, which Q. uses 1x (3.727) and which may well be influential here. Cf. also ω38 Τρώων καὶ Ἀχαιῶν υἷες ἄριστοι. Q. uses Τρώων υἷες only 1x (8.485), but its equivalent Τρώιοι υἷες 22x. Of similar H. expressions with ἐρ. cf. esp. λ631 θεῶν ἐρικυδέα τέκνα, and for ἐρ. with the pl. of υἱός in Q. cf. 2.539, 7.607.

Concessive **περ 178** hints at the incongruity of the Trojans' role.

179 θέμιν...ἰθύνωσιν Way's translation is the most precise — "give just judgement in the warriors' strife", which avoids the zeugma of both θέμιν and νεῖκος as objects of ἰ. θέμιν...ἰ. reflects Hesiod, *Op.* 9 ἴθυνε θέμιστας, 'make straight judgements'. But in νεῖκος...ἰ. the verb means

'decide, resolve correctly'. There seems to be no close precedent for this, but cf. H. νείκεα λύει and κρίνων ν.

180-317: The Debate between Ajax and Odysseus*
*Sometimes referred to as A. and O. in the following analyses.
Rhetorical treatment of the dispute over the arms of Achilles was a tradition that is represented by two other extant versions — Antisthenes' speeches *Ajax* and *Odysseus* (early IV B.C.), and Ovid, *Metamorphoses* 13.1-381; it is also assumed that Aeschylus' lost Ὅπλων κρίσις belonged to it (see S. Radt, *Trag. Graec. Frag.* vol. 3, 288-91). There is little similarity of detail between the versions of Antisthenes and Q., hardly more than any two treatments of the same material would inevitably have in common. Detailed similarity between the versions of Ovid and Q. is most marked in Ajax's speech (the main one in Q.), but also apparent in that of Odysseus. But in spite of the many points of contact between the two versions, their general style and colour is remarkably different, since Q. maintains his H. manner and largely lacks Ovid's rhetorical subtlety and epigrammatic pointedness. The question of whether the similarity between them is better explained by direct dependence or by a common source will be considered after analysis of each speech. All three versions have Ajax's speech followed by Odysseus', but Q. is alone in reflecting the courtroom practice of giving brief second speeches to both parties. However, they are all addressed to the opponent, not to the judges as in Ovid, a feature best explained by their overall H. manner. Q. is also different from Antisthenes and Ovid in that they give a longer and more impressive speech to Odysseus, in Ovid's case 254 lines as opposed to 118 for Ajax, in accordance with his traditional characterisation and with the outcome of the contest, whereas in Q.'s version both Odysseus' speeches are slightly shorter, 52 lines and 10 lines compared with 56 and 14 lines for Ajax. G. W. Elderkin (*Aspects of the Speech in the Later Greek Epic*) notes that the length of the longer speeches in Q. is near the average for Euripides' forensic speeches and also that Q. follows Thucydides' practice in his debates of making the first speaker lose. More importantly, in Q's version Odysseus' main speech has the undeniable weakness of failing to reply to several of Ajax's charges, esp. the ones concerning events prior to those recorded in the *Iliad*, unlike Ovid's version, in which all but two charges (the abandoning of Nestor *Met.* 13.63-72, and the rescue of Odysseus by Ajax *ibid.* 73-81) are answered; for details see the analysis of Odysseus' speech. It is not necessary to attribute these features to incompetence on the poet's part (as do Kakridis [60-61] and Vian [II 13 n. 4]), because a positive purpose is not far to seek. Q.'s intention is surely to make Odysseus' reply deficient and thereby Ajax's defeat all the more unjust, in keeping with Q.'s favourable presentation of Ajax in the earlier narrative and his prejudicial statement at 129-32 (see 128-138n.).

180-236: Ajax's Main Speech
180 introductory line — A. speaks in passion. 181-2 (1) O. is misguided in challenging A. 183-6 (2) At Achilles' death A. killed Trojans while O.

cowered. 186-90 (**3**) O. is inferior to A. in courage and strength, being intent on deceit and shameful deeds. 191-4 (**4**) O. tried to evade service at Troy. 194-6 (**5**) O. was responsible for Philoctetes being marooned on Lemnos. 197-9 (**6**) O. was responsible for the death of Palamedes. 200-10 (**7**) O. forgets his life was once saved by A. in battle; A. wishes he had let O. be killed instead of living to challenge A. 211-4 (**8**) O. did not dare, like A., to beach his ships in an exposed position. 214-6 (**9**) A., not O., saved the Greek ships from fire and Hector. 216-7 (**10**) Hector always yielded to A., but O. feared Hector. 218-23 (**11**) The armour should have been awarded to the one who recovered it from the enemy at the death of Achilles, instead of being claimed now by skill in words. 224-8 (**12**) The armour and spear are too heavy for O., but just right for A. 229-34 (**13**) The claim to be the better fighter should be decided not by words but by deeds. 235-6 (**14**) A. is superior because he is related to Achilles.

(**2**) and (**3**) amount to a statement of the case (πρόθεσις), the claim, as it is expressed at 125, to have saved Achilles' body and to be the best. The same points are resumed and developed by (**11**) and (**13**), which gives the impression of a completed argument. The intervening parts, (**4**) - (**10**), are so many proofs (πίστεις), with (**12**) and (**14**) added for good measure, in the standard manner of forensic speeches. For a similar analysis of this and other speeches see Elderkin (*op. cit.*). The extent to which this resembles Ajax's speech in Ovid's version (*Met.* 13.5-122), in both content and arrangement, is as follows: (**4**) ~ 34-42, (**5**) ~ 43-54 (with close verbal similarity), (**6**) ~ 55-60, (**7**) ~ 73-81, (**9**) ~ 7-8 and 91-94, (**10**) ~ 82-90, (**11**) ~ 121-2, (**12**) ~ 107-12, (**13**) ~ 120 (with verbal similarity), (**14**) ~ 21-33. Q.'s version is closest to Ovid's in citing events outside the *Iliad* — (**4**), (**5**) and (**6**), though even there some details are found only in Ovid. For material derived from H. the link between the versions is considerably looser, (**8**) having no counterpart in Ovid, who does, however, stress the importance of the ships in Ajax's opening words and gestures (3-8). On the other hand, Q. omits the point related to the abandonment of Nestor (63-70), having given separate weight to the episodes of Philoctetes and Palamedes, which are closely linked in Ovid (45-60). Keydell (*Gnomon* 33 [1961] 280-1) has argued convincingly that this situation is wholly compatible with direct imitation of Ovid, indeed just what is to be expected from an author who regularly prefers to follow H. where possible. Q.'s independence in structure is seen in his transfer of Ovid's opening point on words and deeds (9-15) to a climactic position at the end of his speech. Again, the interests of emphasis are served in Q.'s reversal of Ovid's order in the points **9** and **10**, **11** and **12**. Keydell argues (*loc.cit.*) that Q.'s transfer of (**14**) is in the manner of many speeches in Nonnus' *Dionysiaca*, and so is likely to reflect contemporary rhetorical practice. Vian's contrary conclusion (*Rech.* 41-44, II 10-13) that the differences between the versions are only plausibly explained by a common source for Ovid and Q. is supported by nothing more than the arbitrary prejudice that Q. lacked sufficient originality to make substantial innovations in relation to any source used by him, even

though Vian himself (II 12-13) acknowledges Q.'s originality both in the structure of the whole episode and in the relationship between its speeches.

180 ἐν μέσσοισι after the same in 178 is an example of Q.'s indifference to such repetition.

For **μέγ' ἀσχαλόων 180** see 103n., and for **φάτο μῦθον 180** see 122n. The combination ἀσχαλόων φ. μ./ = Dionysius, *Bassarica* frag. 19 verso 21 (see E. Livrea, ed. 1973, 14).

The rhetorical question **181-2** with which Ajax's speech begins is followed by four others (183-6, 191-4, 211-6, 229-31), so that the device characterises the whole speech, setting its emotional tone. Odysseus' main speech also opens with a question, 239, but contains no others, and so it is contrasted as having a calmer tone. In Ovid Ajax's opening exclamation 5-6 has a similar effect.

181 " Ὦ...δαίμων is a slight modification of 1.723-4 " Ὦ Ἀχιλεῦ φρένας αἰνέ, τί ἤ νύ σευ ἤπαφε δαίμων / θυμόν, the beginning of Thersites' mocking speech after the death of Penthesilea. In both cases emendation of the MSS.' ἤκαχε to ἤπαφε has been generally accepted; MSS. give forms of ἀκαχίζω (-έω) instead of ἀπαφίσκω 6x altogether in Q. (see Vian and Battegay ἀπαφίσκω). The nearest H. precedent is ξ488 παρά μ' ἤ. δ./.

181 φρένας αἰνέ with preceding voc. ~ Ο128 Μαινόμενε φρ. ἠλέ, β243 Μέντορ...φρ. ἠλεέ. αἰνός applied to a person in H. is respectful in the formula αἰνότατε Κρονίδη (6x), but abusive in αἰνοτάτη voc. applied to Athena Θ423; cf. νόος αἰνός 11.274.

182 /ἶσον ἐμοὶ φρονέειν ~ Ο50 / ἶ. ἐ. φρονέουσα.

For the reference of **183-90** to 125 see 180-236n.

183/ Ἦ φῂς = Ξ265.

183 αἰνὸν ὅμιλον ~ the H. formula φύλοπιν αἰνήν (2x in Q.).

184 βλημένου...ἔβησαν ~ Δ211 βλήμενος ἦν, περὶ δ' αὐτὸν ἀγηγέραθ' ὅσσοι ἄριστοι, ρ493 /βλημένου ἐν μεγάρῳ. /βλ. ἐν κονίῃσιν is virtually formulaic in Q.: 6.228 /βλήμεναι ἐ. κ., 6.456 /βλημένου ἐν κονίῃ. Q. uses the aor. pass. participle 17x, always at the line beginning.

The placing of **ἐγὼ** and **σεῖο 185-6** underlines the contrast, which has added point after ἶσον ἐμοὶ 182.

185 φόνον στονόεντ' (α) is formulaic in Q. (11x), the adj. in general being used to excess (82x). The nearest H. precedent is βέλεα στ., which Q. uses in the modified form στ. βέλη.

The whole phrase **φόνον...ἐφέηκα (-ε) 185** is virtually formulaic in Q., occurring 3x elsewhere in the same *sedes*.

186 καταπτώσσοντος κ. here and in 193 is in its H. *sedes* (4x); cf. esp. Δ340, where Agamemnon uses it to reproach Odysseus and Menestheus.

186 Ἐπεί νύ... is logically subordinate, in its usual causal sense, to the whole preceding statement ἐγὼ..., not adversative as Vian and Battegay take it (s.v. ἐπεί 3). This combination occurs 6x in H. and 11x in Q. With logical ellipsis of something like Combellack's "And no wonder, because...," it starts a new sentence precisely as at 214. Occasionally in H. ἐπεί introduces a sentence without regular apodosis (see Cunliffe, *LHD* s.v.).

186 γείνατο μήτηρ/ is a H. line end (10x), which Q. uses also 11.68; with the following ἄναλκιν ~ N777 ἀνάλκιδα γ. μ./.

187 δείλαιον καὶ ἄναλκιν ~ H. κακὸν καὶ ἀνάλκιδα (2x; also ἀπτόλεμον κ. ἄ. 1x in H., φυγοπτόλεμος κ. ἄ. 2.68), and esp. γ375 κ. κ. ἄναλκιν. At 240 there is a further variation, ἀργαλέον κ. ἄ., and 7.513 is similar.

187 ἀφαυρότερον περ ἐμεῖο ~ H457 σέο πολλὸν ἀ-ος.

188 ὅσσον...λέοντος amounts to a brief simile, though unusual in its comparative form, closely related to a frequent hunting theme in the similes of H. and Q. Verbally closest is Θ338-9 ὡς ὅτε τίς τε κύων...λέοντος / ἅπτηται. Thematically closest among Q.'s similes is 10.242-3 κύων ὥς, εὖτε λέοντα / ταρβήσας χάσσηται. ὅσ(σ)ον is used 5x in H. to introduce similes of measure, but otherwise in Q. only ὁππόσον 7.730.

188 μεγαλοβρύχοιο is a *hapax* and so possibly Q.'s coinage. As regards μεγα(λο)-, in addition to H. μεγάθυμος, -κήτης and μεγαλήτωρ, Q. has non-H. μεγαλόφρων, μεγασθενής and, possibly original, μεγαλοβρεμέτης. The only precedent for -βρυχος (<βρυχή, βρυχάομαι) is ἐρίβρυχος, first in the *Anthology* (Antipater Sid. II B.C.) and 1x in Q., 3.171 of a lion, though the MSS. have the possibly unique form -βρύχμοιο, defended by Vian (cf. the MSS. 4.241). Of the many H. lion epithets Q. uses only κρατερός, μέγας and σμερδαλέος plus eight non-H. ones in addition to the two with -βρυχ(μ)ος. The present epithet dignifies the image of the lion, equated with Ajax, vis-à-vis the dog, equated with Odysseus, left without qualification.

189 οὐ γάρ...ἦτορ is modelled on one of just two H. uses of μενεδήιος, M247 οὐ γάρ τοι κραδίη μ. This is part of Hector's rebuke of Polydamas, and it is first adapted by Q. to Paris' rebuke of Polydamas, 2.68-70 Π. ...καὶ ἄναλκις / οὐδέ σοι ἐν στέρνοισι πέλει μ. ἦ., / ἀλλὰ..., which influences the whole of 186-90 here. μ. has added significance here because all Q.'s other uses of it are as an epithet of Ajax (1.495, 3.252, 4.439).

190 ἀμφιμέμηλε is the only occurrence of this compound verb. It seems to be a bold coinage by Q., there being no other compound of μέλω, as an intensification of μέμηλε, the H. form used 5x by Q. That is indicated by Combellack's translation "your whole concern is", but Vian (*Rech.* 173) notes it as an example of a compound with redundant preverb; he suggests

the influence of μέλομαι associated with ἀμφί as a prep., A. R. 2.376, 4.491. Possibly it was conceived as equivalent to the H. metaphor φρένας ἀμφιβέβηκεν = "engrosses one's attention", sc. πόνος Z355, ἄχος θ541.
190 δόλος was conjectured in place of the unsatisfactory reading θράσος before it was confirmed as an independent variant.
191-4, Odysseus' attempted evasion of service, corresponds in Ovid's version with 34-42, which, however, differs in explicitly mentioning Odysseus' feigned madness and its detection by Palamedes. Sophocles, *Phil.* 1025-8 draws a contrast between Odysseus' service under compulsion and the willing response of Philoctetes, which suggests that the juxtaposition of the present matter with the treatment of Philoctetes in Ovid's and Q.'s versions follows a well-established tradition. Q.'s version also reflects the one H. mention of the incident, ω115-9, the words of Agamemnon's shade to that of Amphimedon: **191 Ἠὲ...ὅτ'** ~ ω115 Ἦ οὐ μέμνῃ, ὅτε; **191-3 ἐς Ἰλίου...ἐφέπεσθαι** ~ ω117 Ἴλιον εἰς ἅμ' ἕπεσθαι; **194 Ἀτρεΐδαι** ~ ω116 σὺν...Μενελάῳ. Though the role of Palamedes is not mentioned by Q., it is implied retrospectively at 198-9. Variety of tone is obtained at this point with the long rhetorical question followed by a brief wish, which leads into the following points.
191 /Ἠὲ τόδ' ἐξελάθου ~ 3.106 (= 4.55) /ἀλλὰ τά γ' ἐ.
The indirect question introduced by **ὅτ'(ε) 191** has the force of 'what happened when', similar to some H. uses of ὅτε after οἶδα (see Cunliffe, *LHD* ὅτε 1 a β).
191 Ἰλίου ἱερὸν ἄστυ/ = 2.242, 3.216, 284; ~ α2 Τροίης ἱ. πτολίεθρον, Φ128 ἄστυ...Ἰ. ἱρῆς and the frequent H. line end Ἴλιον ἱρήν, used by Q. 6.551. The adj.'s wide range of application in Q. is similar to that in H.
193 καί σε καταπτώσσοντα echoes 186 with rhetorical point, both times perhaps consciously reflecting the application of κ. to Odysseus and Menestheus Δ340.
194-6, the abandonment of Philoctetes, corresponds in Ovid's version with 43-54. The latter is more elaborate, including details of Philoctetes' condition on Lemnos and mentioning the fated need of his bow and arrows for the capture of Troy, but there are close verbal similarities: **194 Ὡς μὴ ὤφελλες ἱκέσθαι,** ~ 43-44 "Atque utinam...nec...umquam venisset"; **195 σῇς γὰρ ὑπ' ἐννεσίῃσι** ~ 45 /"hortator scelerum"; **195 Ποιάντιον υἷα/** ~ 45 "Poeantia proles"/; **196 Λήμνῳ...λίπομεν** ~ 46 "expositum Lemnos...haberet"; **196 μεγάλα στενάχοντα** ~ 48 "saxa moves gemitu". Altogether the relationship between the two versions at this point is such that it can only plausibly be explained by direct imitation combined with freedom to omit or add, such as Q. regularly employs.
194 Ὡς μὴ ὤφελλες ἱκέσθαι The MSS. have changed the Aeolic-epic aor. to the Attic ὤφελες *contra metrum* (see Vian, *Rech.* 150). Only

here and at 468 does Q. use the normal construction of ὡς ὥφ. plus inf.; elsewhere he uses it as an adv. (see 206n.). For μή in hiatus before ὥφ./ὄφ. cf. I698, 10.378.

195 /σῆς γὰρ ὑπ' ἐννεσίῃσι ~ 8.432. The dat. pl. ἐ. occurs only 1x in H., but 24x in Q.

195 κλυτὸν Ποιάντιον υἷα/ ~ γ190 Π. ἀγλαὸν υ./, 9.487 Π. υἷα/.

196 /Λήμνῳ ἐν ἠγαθέῃ = B722, ~ Φ58, 79. Q. applies six different epithets to Λ.

197-9, the death of Palamedes, corresponds in Ovid's version with 55-60. The difference between Q.'s simple transition from the previous point and Ovid's pointedly rhetorical one mirrors the overall stylistic difference between the versions. Ovid also differs from Q. in mentioning the false charge and planted evidence with which Odysseus secured Palamedes' conviction. On the literary and pictorial presentation of Palamedes' story see S.Woodford, *JHS* 114 (1994) 164-9.

197 /οὐκ οἴῳ ~ /οὐκ οἴῃ(ν) 5x in H., /οὐκ οἶος 9.63.

197 λυγρὴν...λώβην seems to be a new combination. Q. avoids the favoured H. epithet of λώβη - θυμαλγής, but uses H. ἀεικής 1x and innovates also with κακή and πολυκηδής.

197 ἐπεμήσαο is a revival of a H. *hapax*— δ437 ἐπεμήδετο in the same *sedes* and construction, and in his one other use (14.479) Q. repeats the H. form.

For **ἀντιθέῳ 198** see 158n.

The statement in **199** that Palamedes was superior to Odysseus βίῃ as well as βουλῇ/ is surprising, but consistent with Q.'s omission of Ovid's emphasis on Palamedes' superior cunning (37-39).

199 ἐύφρονι βουλῇ/ ~ 12.287 ἐ. μύθῳ/, 2.42 ἐύφρονα...μ./. For Q.'s eccentric use of ἐ. see 157n. The present combination was probably intended as a variation of the H. line end ἐπίφρονι(-α) β.; cf. κρατερόφρονι β./ 1.360.

200-10, the rescue of Odysseus in battle by Ajax and the latter's regret, corresponds in Ovid's version with 73-81. While both versions are based on the H. account in Λ, Q. reflects it much more closely (see below), though he omits precisely the well-known point emphasised by Ovid — the use of Ajax's shield (Λ485-6), as well as Ovid's possibly original embellishment —imagined re-use of the shield and questioning of Odysseus' claim to have been incapacitated by wounds. Q. seems to avoid obvious indebtedness to Ovid here.

The long sentence **200-5** is clearly articulated first by οὔτ'...οὔτε with participial phrases of increasing length and then by two relative clauses of almost equal length, the parallel being underlined with ὅς σ' and ὅτε σ'.

200 Νῦν δ' ἤδη is a combination used only here by Q., but occasionally in H., e.g. ξ213.

200 ἐμεῖο...ἔτλης ~ 2.274 Ἡρακλῆι κ. ἐ. ἔτλη.
202 σέο πολλὸν ὑπέρτερον is an intensification of σέο φέρτερος 199 and is echoed by Odysseus 241 (~ 1.105) with rhetorical point.
202 ἐνὶ χάρμῃ/ is a formulaic line end in Q. (10x); it is not H., but cf. ἐπὶ χ./ N104.
203 ὑποτρομέοντα κυδοιμὸν/ ~ 9.113 -ουσα κ./; cf. 'trementem' of Odysseus in Ovid's version (73).
203-4 κυδοιμὸν / δυσμενέων = 13.118-9.
204 ἀνὰ μόθον is a non-H. combination favoured by Q. (8x) in place of H. κατὰ μ. (3x in H., 10x in Q.).
204 οἰωθέντα/ recalls Λ401 /οἰώθη δ' Ὀδυσεύς.
The whole clause **ὅτε σ'...αὐτόν 204-5** paraphrases Λ401-2 οὐδέ τις αὐτῷ / Ἀργείων παρέμεινεν, ἐπεὶ φόβος ἔλλαβε πάντας. Recollection of ἐπεὶ...πάντας gives added point to Q.'s **φεύγοντα καὶ αὐτόν 205** (cf. also Λ461); Vian translates "tu fuyais comme le reste."
205 ἐν δηΐων ὁμάδῳ ~ O689 ἐνὶ Τρώων ὁ., A. R. 2.1077 δηΐου...ἐξ ὁμάδοιο. Here it is decidedly redundant after ἀνὰ μόθον.
206-10 An unfulfilled wish is followed by a final clause with aor. indic. and an unfulfilled conditional statement. The elaborate construction is in sharp contrast to the brief wish at 194.
206 Ὡς ὄφελον is used as an adv. with ἐφόβησεν, which, as noted above (194n.), is the construction preferred by Q., ὡς (αἴθ') ὄφελον being used 20x with indic. (see Vian and Battegay, ὀφείλω 2a). Q.'s usage is isolated in epic and was thought to be peculiar to him (see Koechly, *prol.* LXXVIII). But two precedents occur in epigrams of Callimachus (17.1 Pfeiffer, = Gow-Page, *H. E.*, Call. XLV)—ὤφελε μηδ' ἐγένοντο, and Alcaeus of Messene (early II B.C., *A.P.* 9.519.3-4, = G.-P., Alc. II)—ὡς ὄφελον...ἐξέπιον. Otherwise it is only in prose, in the *Septuagint* and later, that ὄφελον is used, not uncommonly, as an adv. It is more likely that Q. allowed himself to be influenced by prose usage than that he consciously appealed to isolated poetic precedents. The same construction is used again in the present passage, 218-22, where similarity extends to a following final clause with ὄφρα and aor. indic., a sequence that occurs also 4.30-31 and 7.701-2 (see Vian and Battegay, ὄφρα 2e, and Koechly, *prol.* LXXXVIII). This construction is normal in Attic (see Goodwin, *M. T.* 333), but it is not H. and may be unprecedented in epic. However, Q. may have seen H. precedent in Z 345-8 ὥς μ' ὄφελ'..ἔνθα...ἀπόερσε, where ἔνθα has virtually the force of ὄφρα and Monro (*GHD* 325) regards the construction as "the same in principle as the use of past tenses in final clauses."
206-7 The imagined intervention of Zeus to deter Ajax on the battlefield recalls Θ133-5, the hurling of a thunderbolt to deter Nestor and Diomedes, as well as Λ 544-7, the description of Ajax's retreat.

For the periphrasis in **ἐμεῖο θρασὺ σθένος 206** see 4n.; θρασὺ is added to σ. plus gen. of proper name 7x in Q. Self-application by the speaker here gives the expression unusual contextual force.

206 ἐν δαὶ κείνῃ/ = 2.526 and possibly (conjectured) 1.448, 10.104; ~ ἐ. δ. λυγρῇ/ 2x in H. and 2x in Hesiod.

In **ὄφρα...σφετέροισι 207-9** the shame of Odysseus' imagined gruesome fate is underlined by the emphatically separated apposition of σε and δαῖτα.

208 ἀμφιτόμοις ξιφέεσι ἀ. is not H. and occurs first in tragedy; it is a synonym of ἀμφήκης, H. epithet of ξίφος and φάσγανον.

208 διὰ μελεϊστὶ κέδασσαν ~ ι291 δ. μ. ταμών, σ339 δ. μ. τάμῃσιν. Probably influential on the whole statement was ω409 ᾗσι κυσὶν μ. ταμὼν προύθηκεν 'Αχιλλεύς. Q.'s one other use of μ. is at 358, of the contemplated killing of Odysseus by Ajax. Q. uses non-H. διακεδάννυμι in tmesis 3x elsewhere (see Campbell on 12.567-8).

209 δαῖτα κυσὶ The use of δ. other than for a human meal is exceptional in H. and Q., but cf. ω43, 13.140 and e.g. Euripides, *Ion* 505-6. Q. may well have had in mind the well-known variant Α 4-5 ἑλώρια τεῦχε κύνεσσιν / οἰωνοῖσί τε δαῖτα (for πᾶσι).

209 οὐκ ἂν ἐμεῖο is an example of fourth-foot trochaic caesura, which Q. does not completely avoid (see Vian, *Rech.* 242-3).

209-10 καὶ οὐκ...κατέναντα is the negative counterpart of 200, with rhetorical point in the verbal echoing with variation.

210 δολοφροσύνῃσι πεποιθώς/ ~ Β588 προθυμίῃσι π./, Β792 ποδωκείῃσι π./; the expression pointedly recalls 190.

211-4 refers to the statement given twice in the *Iliad* (Θ 222-6 = Λ 5-9) of the positions of the ships, those of Odysseus being in the middle and those of Ajax and Achilles at opposite ends. The latter positions were regarded as most honourable, reflecting the Greek attitude to the corresponding positions in battle, and H. comments that Ajax and Achilles were ἠνορέῃ πίσυνοι καὶ κάρτεϊ χειρῶν (Θ226 = Λ9). Q. alludes to this with **βίῃ...εὐχόμενος 211-2**, and he echoes ἐν μεσσάτῳ (Θ223 = Λ6) with **μέσσοισιν 212** and ἔσχατα...εἴρυσαν (Θ 225-6 = Λ 8-9) with **ἔκτοσθεν ἐρύσσαι 213**. As noted above (on 180-236), this has no counterpart in Ovid's version. This time the rhetorical question is answered by the speaker himself (see 181-2n. and 191-4n.).

211 /Σχέτλιε, τίπτε It can hardly be accidental that the only two H. cases of this line beginning are in questions addressed to Odysseus (ι494, λ474), or that in Q.'s only other use of it, Memnon to Achilles 2.414, it is followed by (415) πάντων εὐχόμενος πολὺ φέρτατος (Vian for MSS.' -τερος) ἔμμεναι ἀνδρῶν, of which **βίῃ...εὐχόμενος 211-2** is a slight modification. This participial phrase has the force of a hypothetical clause separating and emphasising τίπτε and μέσσοισιν κτλ.

Vian (*Rech.* 150-1) has restored the MSS.' **ἔχες 212** for the emendation ἔχεις accepted by Koechly and Zimmermann; the imperf. has the advantage of consistency with the following ἔτλης.

213-4 θοὰς...νῆας θ. is a regular epithet of νηῦς in Q. (13x or 14x) as in H.

For **'Επεί νυ 214** see 186n. Vian and Pompella follow earlier editors in ending the question at νῆας; 214, with an answer following. At least some MSS. end it at ἐπήιεν; 214, which is possible, but less effective rhetorically than the long question plus short answer, esp. in view of the parallel at 186.

214 σε τάρβος ἐπήιεν ἐ. of a state or condition coming upon a person has one H. precedent—A29 μιν...γῆρας ἔπεισιν, which Q. echoes in his only other similar use of ἐ., 4.320 (= 12.271).

214-7 The long-short pattern noted above is repeated in the ἐγὼ-σὺ contrast. By a natural progression Ajax passes from the positions of the ships to his own defence of them as narrated O 674-746 (cf. Sophocles, *Aj.* 1276 ff.) and to his repeated role in the *Iliad* as the Greek champion who faces Hector in combat (H 175-312, N 190-205, 673-722, Ξ 402-39). Ajax's protection of the ships is mentioned twice in Ovid's version, 7-8 and 91-94, the first time in similar terms to Q.: "at non Hectoreis dubitavit [sc. Ulixes] cedere flammis, /quas ego sustinui..." In the present passage the brief statement that Hector regularly yielded to A. whilst O. feared him corresponds only loosely with Ovid 82-90, which includes details of specific defeats of Hector by Ajax, esp. their duel.

214-5 αἰνὸν / πῦρ ~ 9.235; it is not a H. combination, but cf. P565 πυρὸς α....μένος.

215 ὑπ' ἀταρβέι θυμῷ/ is a strong positive counterpart of οὐδέ τι θυμῷ/ 212.

216 μ' ὑπόεικε is the MSS.' reading, restored by Vian and Pompella, while Koechly (after Spitzner) and Zimmermann emend to μοι ὕπεικε. The problem is discussed by Vian, *Rech.* 147-8. ὑ. plus dat. is usual in H. and Q., but elision of μοι or σοι, though H. (Monro, *GHD* 376), is not otherwise found in Q. ὑ. plus acc., on the analogy of φεύγω *et sim.*, occurs 1x in H. (O 227-8) and 1x elsewhere in Q., 10.102 μιν...ὑπόεικον, where emendation has been attempted, but unconvincingly. Also Q., like H., prefers forms of ὑ. that observe digamma in the stem - ὑπόεικε(-ον) 6x. Therefore the MSS.' reading is preferable.

217 μιν <μέγα> δείδιες is read by Zimmermann and Vian. The reading of most MSS. is unmetrical. Rhodomann restored metre with <μάλα> δ., and two late MSS. read περιδείδιες, which is accepted by Koechly and Pompella. π. occurs 4x in Q., including περιδείδιε 8.430 in the same *sedes*. All three readings are no more than plausible emendations.

218-23 is similar to the much briefer statement at Ovid 121-2 that the armour should be returned to the enemy and awarded to the one who could

recover it. 218-22 repeats the syntactical pattern of 206-10—a main clause with ὡς ὄφελον and aor. indic., and a final clause with ὄφρα and aor. indic., the only difference being a temporal clause between these instead of a conditional statement at the end.

218 ἄεθλον is taken by Way and Combellack as 'contest', but by Lehrs, Vian and Pompella as 'prize'. The latter is more appropriate as the object of **θῆκεν 219** (cf. 2-3 τεύχη θ. and 232-3 τόδ' ἄ....θ.), so that **ἔντεα 221** denotes the same object; cf. Ovid 121 "arma...mittantur in hostes."

219 Ἀχιλῆι δεδουπότι The gen. δεδουπότος as a synonym of τεθνηκότος occurs 1x in H., 2x in A.R. and 10x in Q., as well as other cases 9x, a good example of Q.'s liking for distinctively epic words.

219 δῆρις ὀρώρει/ is formulaic in Q. (8x); ~ H. δοῦπος ὀ./, νεῖκος ὀ./, μῶλος ὀ./

220-1 The construction with **ἔδρακες** is an effective way of emphasising the impact on Odysseus and his passivity in contrast with Ajax's courageous action.

221 ποτὶ κλισίας = 7.709, ~ ἐπὶ κ. 9.39; Q. avoids the H. formulae κ. καὶ νῆας (6x) and κ. τε νέας τε (2x).

222 αὐτῷ ὁμῶς Ἀχιλῆι This use of ὁμῶς as a prep. with dat. denoting spacial or temporal association, 'together with', is remarkably frequent in Q., approx. half of the 86 occurrences of ὁ.; cf. esp. 13.95, where it is strengthened by the dat. of αὐτός as here. Emphasis on Achilles' body may be an original touch, as it is not found in Ovid. In H. ὁ. is mostly adv.; it occurs 6x with dat., but in a different sense, 'equally to', 'no less than', not physical association. All of A.R.'s 27 uses of ὁ. seem to be adv. Q.'s usage is idiosyncratic and possibly original; see Campbell on 12.57.

In **222-3** the conventional contrast between **μύθων** and **ἔργων** is underlined by placement at the line ends, by enjambment of **μύθων / ἰδρείῃ** and by the addition of μεγάλων with ἔργων; ~ Π 359 ἰ. πολέμοιο.

223 ἰδρείῃ πίσυνος ~ ἠνορέῃ πίσυνοι Θ226 = Λ9, which Q. reflects with ἠ. πίσυνος 284 in Odysseus' reply.

223 μεγάλων ἐπιμαίεαι ἔργων/ ~ Hesiod, *Cat.* 33(a). 26 μ. ἐπεμαίετο ἔ./

224-8, the weight of the armour, is a point prepared for in 112-3. The argument corresponds with 107-12 in Ovid's version, which differs in that helmet, spear and shield are singled out for mention as too heavy for Odysseus. As noted above (128-38n.), there is an important foreshadowing of the present motif in the award of Memnon's armour to Ajax 4.436-64, esp. 461-2, where it is stated that he alone could wear it. The two contrasted pairs of statements about the armour's suitability, negative for Odysseus and positive for Ajax, are of equal length, with **ἐμοὶ δ' 226** placed emphatically at the mid point.

224 σθένος ἐστὶν plus inf. seems a distinctively Q. expression (5x); in earlier epic cf. Oppian, *Hal.* 2.132.
For the application of **ἀκαμάτοισι 224** to ἔντεσιν see 28n.
For **Αἰακίδαο δαΐφρονος 225** see 75n. and 5n. on θρασύφρονος Α.
225 οὐδὲ μὲν is the reading of all the MSS., but is emended to οὐδὲ μέγ' by Koechly and Zimmermann, which is indefensible, esp. because οὐδὲ μὲν occurs 14x in Q.
The whole expression **ἔγχος / νωμῆσαι παλάμῃσιν 225-6** echoes E594 Ἄρης δ' ἐν π. πελώριον ἔ. ἐνώμα, where πελώριον may have encouraged the unwarranted emendation μέγ' here; ~ 3.251 ἔ. ἐνώμα.
227 ἄρτια, emphasised by enjambment, seems to involve a play on two slightly different meanings. One is 'fitting' = 'appropriate', as Q. otherwise (2x) uses the word and as is suggested by the following ἔοικε. The other meaning is 'fitting' in a physical sense, as the context suggests. Koechly (after the MS. R and Heyne) emends to ἄρμενα, which is H. in the required sense, but is otherwise used by Q. only as a noun meaning 'ship's tackle'. Vian in his apparatus suggests reading ἀντία, from ἄντια in one MS. (P), with the radically different but still appropriate meaning "Mihi autem haec omnia plane diversa sunt." Lloyd-Jones (*CR* 17 [1967] 275) suggests ἄξια, which is unlikely to have been corrupted. But emendation is not required.
227 ἀγλαὰ τεύχη is not a H. expression. Q. makes Ajax repeat it at 230, perhaps for effect, but otherwise he has only ἀ. τεύχε' 1.364 in a different *sedes.*
228 /οὔ τι καταισχύνοντι reflects one of only four H. uses of κ., ω512 /οὔ τι καταισχύνοντα, which Q. repeats precisely 7.703 and with variation 14.531.
The change from τεύχη to **θεοῦ...δῶρα 228** emphasises focus on the moral aspect, which is a feature of Ovid's treatment.
228 περικαλλέα δῶρα/ occurs 3x in H. and 4x in Q.; the adj. underlines the force of ἀγλαὰ 227.
229-34 Ajax poses a rhetorical question that implies a negative answer, and then justifies it with observations drawing a contrast between **Ἀλκῆς 232, ἐπέων 233** and **Μύθων 234**. Vian (II 11 n.4) notes the similarity in Ovid's version of 120 "denique quid verbis opus est? spectemur agendo," but concludes that this parallel is not very significant in view of the undoubted influence of two H. passages (Π 630-1, Υ 244-58) on Q.'s thought and expression both here and 2.449-51. This fails to account for the importance of the same closing point in both versions. Koechly (after Tychsen) punctuates the end of the question at τεύχη;/ 230, positing a lacuna of one line containing a challenge to an armed contest, which introduced the indirect question ὅς τις... 231. But that is gratuitous, because

there is no problem in the text as it is, the indirect question being governed by ἐριδμαίνοντε 229. C. L. Struve (*Gramm. und krit. Bemerkungen zum Q. S.*, Königsberg 1816-22) suggests placing 231 before 230 to avoid harshness, which Vian (*Rech.* 205) rejects as unnecessary.

229 μύθοισιν ἐριδμαίνοντε ~ 128 (see n. *ad loc.*).

229 μύθοισιν...κακοῖσιν is ambiguous—cf. Vian's 'paroles vaines' and Way's 'words discourteous'; the latter seems to be supported by ἀλεγεινῶν...ἐπέων 232-3.

230 'Αχιλῆος ἀμύμονος...τεύχη ~ 224-5; 'Α. ἀ. occurs 2x in H. and 4x in Q.

231 φθισήνορι χάρμῃ is possibly a novel expression; see 25n. on πόλεμοι φθ. It emphasises the contrast between the site of Ajax's preeminence and that of Odysseus.

The flow of thought in **232-4** makes it preferable to punctuate with a colon at the end of 233, as do Koechly and Zimmermann.

For **ἄεθλον...θῆκεν 232-3** see 218-9n.

233 θῆκεν...Θέτις ~ 3 (see n. *ad loc.*). μέσσοισι at 3 may be thought to favour the variant μέσσοισιν here, read by Koechly. But that involves abnormal synizesis of ἐπέων to form an iambus; its two other occurrences in Q. (4.124, 6.76) are trisyllabic.

233 Θέτις ἀργυρόπεζα/ is a frequent formula in H.; otherwise in Q. it occurs only 3.101; see 3n.

234 εἰν ἀγορῇ in this *sedes* occurs 8x in H., elsewhere in Q. 4.124, and at the line beginning 4.126.

234 Μύθων...χρειὼ πέλει ~ 258.

234 πέλει ἀνθρώποισιν/ = δ565; see Campbell on 12.184.

235-6 Ajax concludes with an assertion of general superiority, in which γὰρ implies "I say all this because...". This is supported with a specific point in his own favour hitherto unmentioned, his family connection with Achilles (as first cousins), the logical link being no more than implied by epic parataxis. Abrupt and undeveloped mention of this point, as though an afterthought, enhances its impact; see 180-236n. In Ovid's version it is developed at some length early in Ajax's speech (21-33) and associated with the negative aspects of Odysseus' ancestry.

235 ἀγαυότερος καὶ ἀρείων/ ~ H. πρότερος κ. ἀ./ (3x); ~ 3.540 βριθύτερον...καὶ ἄρειον.

236 μεγάλῳ 'Αχιλῆι μ. is not applied to Achilles in H. and only 2x elsewhere in Q. It is applied widely to heroes in both H. and Q., 5x to Ajax in Q., differently from its use with the distinguishing article Αἴας ὁ μέγας Π358. This background may be felt to give point to its use in the statement of affinity.

237-290: Odysseus' Main Speech

237-8 introductory lines—O. speaks in bitter reproach. 239 (**1**) Why has A. indulged in empty wordiness? 240-2 (**2**) O. is superior to A. in wit and

eloquence, which give strength. 243-52 (**3**) All human achievements depend on intelligence and skill, and so in all undertakings the intelligent man is superior. 253-5 (**4**) That is why Diomedes chose O. to spy on the Trojans with him, which was a great achievement. 256-62 (**5**) O. secured Achilles' service at Troy, and if anyone else is needed he will be brought by O.'s persuasion alone. 262-7 (**6**) Strength comes from combined eloquence and intelligence, whereas courage and size alone are of no avail. O.'s combination of strength and intelligence benefits the Greeks. 268-75 (**7**) A. claims wrongly that he saved O. when fleeing in battle; he only saved himself. 275-8 (**8**) O. beached his ships in the middle not because of fear but to be available with counsel. 278-81 (**9**) O. disfigured himself in order to spy on the Trojans and gain important information. 282-4 (**10**) O. did not fear Hector, but responded to his challenge of single combat. 285-6 (**11**) O. saved Achilles' body and armour by killing more of the enemy than A. 287-9 (**12**) O. is not afraid of A.'s spear, but is suffering from a wound sustained in defending Achilles. 290 (**13**) O. like Achilles is descended from Zeus.

As Vian observes (II 13), Odysseus argues his case in a strikingly different way from Ajax's largely chronological recital of achievements, putting the main emphasis on his superior intelligence. (**2**)-(**6**) is devoted exclusively to that, with (**3**), no fewer than ten lines, putting the argument on a general, almost philosophical, plane. This can be regarded as loosely an answer to Ajax's claim 186-90 that Odysseus is inferior in courage and strength, but it is only from (**7**) that Odysseus answers Ajax point by point: (**7**) ~ 200-10, (**8**) ~ 211-4, (**10**) ~ 216-7, (**11**) ~ 183-6 and 218-23, (**12**) ~ 229-34, (**13**) ~ 235-6. (**9**) is an exception, breaking the series of correspondences with a matter not mentioned by Ajax. At the same time, as noted above (180-317n.), Odysseus' speech is remarkable for the extent to which it fails to answer charges made by Ajax: O.'s evasion of service (191-4), his treatment of Philoctetes (194-6) and Palamedes (197-9), his failure to defend the ships (214-6) and his inability to wear Achilles' armour (224-8). In Ovid's version all these charges are answered by Odysseus, which amounts to notable independence on Q.'s part, if in fact Ovid was his primary source. Against this major difference, however, must be weighed the fact that, although there is obviously not so close a similarity between the speeches of Odysseus in the two versions as between those of Ajax, particularly as regards arrangement of points, the former do have many points in common: (**2**) ~ Ovid 135-9, (**4**) ~ 238-54, (**5**) ~ 162-80 and 313-34, (**6**) ~ 362-9, (**10**) ~ 275-9, (**12**) ~ 262-7, (**13**) ~ 140-58, with some verbal similarity in the last case (see n. *ad loc.*). Q.'s structural independence is seen most clearly in his bringing together in **2-6** the points on the value of intelligence which are widely separated in Ovid. Note also the skilful way in which Q. concludes O.'s speech with a rapid coverage of related arguments in favour of his courage in **10**, **11**, **12** leading to the climactic point **13**. These arguments are scattered and given independent elaboration in Ovid. The relationship between this speech and its counterpart in Ovid is

certainly compatible with the case for direct imitation of Ovid by Q. as presented above (180-236n.).

237 παραβλήδην occurs only here in Q. and 1x in early epic, Δ6 π. ἀγορεύων/ (cf. ἀγορεύεις/ below 239), where ancient interpretation was divided between 'deceptively' and 'in reply'. At least most of A.R.'s eight uses = 'in reply'; for full discussion see Campbell on 3.107 (comm. 1994), who accepts Vian and Battegay's interpretation here, 'en réponse', though with hesitation. The present context hardly allows 'deceptively', which would be awkward after ἀλεγεινὰ; the whole phrase ἀ. π. ἐνένιπεν = "rebuked (him) hurtfully in reply". Vian's "riposte avec une dure ironie" is inconsistent with Vian and Battegay, as noted by W. Appel ("Die homerischen hapax legomena bei Q.S.: Adverbien", *Glotta* 71 [1993] 178-88).

237 ἐνένιπεν, the H. reduplicated aor. of ἐνίπτω, is Koechly's emendation, accepted by Zimmermann and Vian (*Rech.* 166) but not by Pompella, for the MSS.' ἐνένισπεν. Since the latter form is attested by some MSS. of H. (see LSJ s.v.) and is read by all MSS. in three of its four uses by Q. (see Vian and Battegay s.v.), there is a case for attributing it to Q. himself.

238 υἱὸς...νωμῶν Vian notes the close resemblance of Hesiod, *Cat.* frag. 198.3, υἱὸς Λαέρταο πολύκροτα μήδεα εἰδώς, which may well have been familiar to Q. and 'corrected' by him to -τροπα in view of the ancient variants πολύτροπον, -κροτον at α1 (see Campbell on 12.171). The likelihood of pointed allusion to the opening words of the *Odyssey* is increased by the fact that Q. does not otherwise apply π. to Odysseus. By replacing εἰδώς with νωμῶν, 'wielding', metaphorically of mental activity, which is unique in Q. and based on ν255 νόον πολυκερδέα ν./, Q. makes the phrase not a fixed characterisation, but a statement of action—"using his wily wits" (Combellack).

239 "Αἶαν...ἀγορεύεις; is a clever adaptation both of N824, Αἶαν ἁμαρτοεπές, βουγάϊε, ποῖον ἔειπες, said by Hector as a challenge to Ajax in battle, and of the description of Thersites B212-4, ἀμετροεπής.../ὅς ῥ' ἔπεα φρεσὶν ᾗσιν ἄκοσμά τε πολλά τε ᾔδη, /μάψ... The two key words taken from the latter passage are not otherwise used by Q. There is irony in Odysseus insulting Ajax, after his uncharacteristically long speech, with the same terms that are applied to Thersites—in the following account in B Thersites is publicly humiliated by Odysseus. For once Q. achieves all the allusive wit of Callimachus.

240-2 Odysseus contrasts Ajax's assertions of Odysseus' inferiority with his own claim to intellectual superiority, **ὃς 241** having the force of 'whereas'.

The three adjs. in **240** refer particularly to 187, with repetition of ἄναλκιν, and to 190. **ἀργαλέον** is H. and used to excess by Q., 95x,

including 8x of humans = 'troublesome', which is post-H. (see LSJ s.v. 2). Its superlative is applied by Ajax to Odysseus at 292 (cf. also 468).
Vian (*Rech.* 224) justifies emendation of με φῆσθα **240** to **μ' ἔφησθα** as being one of the verbs with which augment prevails over diaeresis in Q.
242 The claim made for the power of intellect and eloquence is intended to answer esp. Ajax's criticism at 222-3 (cf. also 229 and 234).
242 ἀνδράσι κάρτος ἀέξει/ ~ Z261 ἀνδρὶ...μένος...ἀ./, M214 κράτος...ἀέξειν/, 2.187, 4.332 κ. ἀέξων/.
243-50 The brief general statement in 242 introduces what Vian calls an "éloge de l' intelligence" and Kakridis (61) ὁ ὄμορφος ὕμνος στὸ νοητικό, the most striking element in Odysseus' speech, without parallel in the versions of Ovid and Antisthenes. Its primary model is Nestor's advice to Antilochus before the chariot race Ψ 315-8. That cites three examples of success achieved by 'skill', μῆτις—woodcutter, sailor, which is the only one with descriptive elaboration, and charioteer, with the instrumental dat. μήτι as first word each time. Q. makes Odysseus cite four such examples, all with some elaboration—quarriers, sailors, hunters and drivers, probably ploughmen, attention being focused on beasts (bulls) instead of men in the last case by change to a passive form of statement. Formal variety is achieved, both internally and in relation to the H. model, by careful placement of emphatic instrumental datives. The first two are **μήτι**, but the first is strikingly postponed to the mid point of the statement. The third dat. is the synonym **τέχνῃσιν** as first word, and the fourth is a loose equivalent, **ἀνθρώπων ἰότητι**, as last words. A further innovation is the addition of a concluding summation at 250 with **Νόῳ**, another synonym of μῆτι, as first word. Kakridis is alone in noting a secondary model, though he does not elaborate, sc. the first half of the first stasimon of Sophocles, *Ant.*, 332-52, πολλὰ τὰ δεινά κτλ., for content only, not for expression, in which the examples of successful human ingenuity are sailor, ploughman, fowler, hunter and fisherman, with a concluding shift of focus, as in Q., to the control of beasts—unspecified beast, horse and bull. Of Q.'s examples only the quarriers are wholly different from Sophocles' list. His final focus on bulls may also reflect the influence of another passage of Sophocles, as noted by Vian and Kakridis, *Ajax* 1250-4, in a speech of Agamemnon relevant to the whole present episode (see 169-170n.). A further paradigm, direct or indirect, may be seen in Prometheus' exposition of his gifts to man in [Aeschylus] *PV* 442-71, 476-506. Prometheus lists sailing and the adaptation of animals; Q.'s quarriers may owe something to Prometheus' reference to the provision of shelter and the recovery of metals from beneath the earth. Finally it should be noted that there are some similarities to scenes in the preceding shield description: hunting 17-24, yoked oxen 60, ships on a stormy sea 80-87.
243-5 By substituting quarriers, **λατόμοι**, for H.'s woodcutter, δρυτόμος, Q. combines close imitation with substantial originality in the

first of his examples. The choice of quarriers is strikingly specific and may have local or contemporary reference.
243 ἠλίβατον πέτρην and -ος -η are H. in this *sedes* (1x each, used only here by Q.). ἠ. is ornamental, consistent with ἐν οὔρεσι 244, whilst contextual point attaches to **ἄρρηκτον**, which is not a traditional epithet of rocks, though Q. applies it to πέτρην 4.8-9. **244 ὑποτμήγουσιν** The verb occurs only 1x before Q., A.R. 4.328 in a different metaphorical sense, so that Q.'s use of it 3x is remarkable. Its literal sense, 'cut below, undermine', is appropriate here, but so also is 'cut gradually', which ὑπο- allows. The same ambiguity applies to Q.'s similar use of it 9.379-80 πέτρην παιπαλόεσσαν...ἁλὸς ἅλμη / δάμνατ' ὑποτμήγουσα μάλα στερεήν περ ἐοῦσαν.
244 λατόμοι ἄνδρες λ. seems not to have been used in poetry before Q., who gives it an epic tone by adding ἄνδρες; cf. e.g. Z315 τέκτονες ἄ.
245 /ῥηιδίως in emphatic enjambment at the end of the first example makes a point, in contrast to ἄρρηκτον 243, that is not necessarily applicable to the following examples.
245-6 Q.'s second example, sailors, corresponds with the second and only elaborated example in the H. model, and here imitation is most detailed, though with much variation, including a change from κυβερνήτης Ψ316 to **ναῦται 246**.
245 μέγαν βαρυηχέα πόντον/ ~ Ψ316 οἴνοπι πόντῳ/. β., also with π. 4.60, is not H., but cf. πολυηχής of a seashore Δ422, of the sea 14.539.
246 ὑπεκπερόωσιν combines the notions of 'crossing', as in περάω and ἐκπεράω, both used of crossing the sea in H. but not in Q., and of 'escaping', as in ὑπεκφεύγω, used by H. and Q. The compound may have been coined by Q., who shows a liking for compounds in ὑπεκ-, using four others.
246 ὅτ' ἄσπετα κυμαίνηται ~ Ψ317 νῆα...ἐρεχθομένην ἀνέμοισιν.
247-8 The particular animals overcome by hunters are all subjects of similes in H. and Q.
247 ἀγρόται Attic correption in the first syllable of ἀ. occurs also at 22 and 374; see Koechly, *prol.* XXXVI, on Q.'s liking for Attic correption in general.
247 κρατεροὺς...λέοντας/ = 7.487; see 188n. on lion epithets.
248 πορδάλιας for the MSS.' παρδ- has been adopted by editors since Koechly; see 19n.
248 ἔθνεα θηρῶν/ = Empedocles, *Phys.* 16(26).4 (ed. Wright 1981), with ἔ. in the non-H. sense of 'kinds' (thus Combellack), 'species', a meaning not recognised by Vian and Battegay.
249 ταῦροι δ' ὀβριμόθυμοι is a novel application of ὀ., which appears in early epic only at Hesiod, *Th.* 140, of a Cyclops. There is no

similar epithet of ταῦρος or βοῦς in H. Q. uses ὁ. no less than 27x, mostly of humans, but of a lion 406, of wolves 10.183.
249 δαμόωνται after δαμόωσι 247 emphasises the idea of dominance and is not a stylistic weakness, *pace*. L. Castiglioni ("Intorno a Q.S.", *Byz-Neugriech. Jahrb.* 2 [1921] 33-52).
250 ἀνθρώπων ἰότητι ~ θεῶν ἰ. 7x in H. and 3x in Q.; ~ αἰζηῶν ἰ. 2.374. Both here and 2.374 Vian and Battegay claim that ἰ. = not 'will' but 'skill', which is unparalleled and unnecessary. ἀ. near the end of this statement is contrasted with θηρῶν at the end of the last example.
250 Νόῳ...τελεῖται ~ τὰ (δὲ) δὴ νῦν πάντα τελεῖται 6x in H.
251-2 A general statement of the advantage of intelligence in deeds as well as in words, expanding on the pointed conclusion in 250, answers the statement of Ajax about the use of words at 234 and echoes the personal claim at 240-2. That is the reason for emphasis on **πόνοισι / πᾶσι**. Repetition of 155 is incorporated with separation of αἰεὶ δ' and change of γέρων to ἀνήρ. Elaborate chiasmus throws emphasis onto the contrast between **ἀφραδέος** and **πολύιδρις**.
251 ἀμφὶ πόνοισι is Rhodomann's palmary emendation of the MSS.' ἀμφιπόλοισι. The use of ἀμφὶ parallel to the following ἐν is eccentric, as noted by Vian and Battegay s.v. 3a, but is in keeping with Q.'s overuse of ἀμφί in general.
253-5 The brief statement of Odysseus' partnership with Diomedes in the *Dolonia* (K) has no similarity of detail to Ovid's more elaborate treatment (239-52).
The placement of **ἐυφρονέοντα 253** serves as an emphatic link with the preceding statement; its juxtaposition with θρασὺς marks the contrast of characters.
253 θρασὺς πάις Οἰνεΐδαο ~ K497 O. πάις, unusual abbreviation of the three generations Oineus, Tydeus, Diomedes.
254 ἐπιτάρροθον is Q.'s only use of the word, different from its use in H. always of a deity as 'helper'. The same is true of the H. use of the variant ἐπίρροθος, which Q. uses of Achilles at 257 as a pointed verbal link.
255 ἐς φύλακας ~ K97 ἐς τοὺς φ.
255 μέγα δ' ἔργον In all other occurrences of μ. ἔ. in H. and Q. digamma is observed.
256-62 From his having been chosen as helper by Diomedes Odysseus passes first to his success in bringing Achilles as helper on the expedition to Troy, and secondly to the prediction that the bringing of any further help will depend on his skills. The former refers to Odysseus' detection of Achilles' disguise as a girl by his mother, which Ovid recounts with dramatic elaboration (162-70), unlike Q.'s bare mention, which perhaps consciously avoids details discreditable to Achilles. Then the prediction foreshadows Odysseus' success in enlisting the help of Neoptolemus and

Philoctetes, which Q. recounts respectively in books 7 and 9. Ovid makes Odysseus anticipate his success with Philoctetes explicitly and at some length (320-4), whereas Q. leaves the reader to apply knowledge of the tradition.

256 Πηλῆος...υἷα is rightly preferred by all editors to the variant Π. ἐυσθενέα κ. υ., which has two epithets in awkward asyndeton; also cf. 4.190 Π. ἐυσθενέος παράκοιτιν and 1.668 Π. ἀμύμονος υἷα. ἐυσθενής is not H., but favoured by Q. (31x).

257 /ἤγαγον 'Ατρείδῃσιν, "I brought (Achilles) for the A.", is a clever adaptation, in character for Odysseus, of Ajax's words at 194, /ἤγαγον 'Ατρεῖδαι, "the A. brought (you against your will)." The accusation made there by Ajax is not answered explicitly by Odysseus, but here he may be understood as implying that by detecting Achilles' evasion he compensated for his own.

The emphatic enjambment of **ἄλλου / ἥρωος 257-8** is echoed in the same sentence by that of **ἄλλων/ 'Αργείων 259-60**.

For **ἥρωος χρειὼ...πέληται 258** see 234n.

The point implied by the emphatic **οὐδ' ὅ γε 259** is "no more than was the case with Achilles".

261 μειλιχίοισι...ἐπέεσι ~ π279 μειλιχίοις ἐ. παραυδῶν, 13.407 μ....παραυδήσας ἐ.; here the combination is effectively contrasted with χερσὶ and βουλῇσιν (259-60).

262 /δῆριν ἐς αἰζηῶν ~ 1.223 /δ. ἐς αἱματόεσσαν, 6.12 /δ. ἐς ἀργαλέην.

262-7 Odysseus elaborates on his earlier claim to excel in intelligence and eloquence, 241-2, with verbal echoes: **262 κράτος ἀνδράσι** ~ 242 ἀ. κάρτος, **264 ἀέξει/** = 242. In the general statement μῦθος plus ἐυφροσύνη is contrasted with ἠνορέη and μέγεθος lacking μῆτις, the addition of μέγεθος, 'physical size', being a pointed reference to Ajax. Cf. A.R. 3.188-90 for the contrast between μῦθος and ἠνορέη, though similarity is limited to those terms. Odysseus goes on to claim for himself a combination of physical κάρτος and mental μῆτις.

262 κράτος The form occurs only 2x in Q., κάρτος κτλ. 62x. Both are H., with κράτος more frequent, but later κάρτος was regarded as distinctively epic (or poetic). Thus A.R. has κάρτος 10x, κράτος 3x.

263 /γίνετ' ἐυφροσύνῃ is preferable to the variant γίνεται εὐ. because Q. prefers disyllabic ἐυ- wherever possible, and elision of verbal -αι is regular in Q. as in H.; cf. e.g. 1.474 /γίνετ'. For Q.'s eccentric use of ἐυφροσ. and ἐύφρων see 157n.

263 ἐυφροσύνῃ μεμελημένος is Hermann's emendation, accepted by Koechly, Zimmermann and Vian, for the MSS.' unmetrical -ῃ μεμιγμένος. Earlier editors restore metre with -ῃσι μεμιγ., which is linguistically acceptable, but does not account for the corruption. The same is true of

Vian's text, which Koechly supports with reference to 4.500 ἱππασίῃ μεμελημένον ἦτορ. There μ. has the active sense 'concerned with', a rare and late usage, whereas here either active or passive meaning seems possible. The use of μεμιγ. for a 'combination' of abstract qualities is unusual and has no parallel in Q.'s usage, but it is hardly objectionable. Pompella retains it and restores metre with preceding γε, which gives appropriate emphasis as well as a plausible explanation of the corruption. For **ἠνορέῃ δὲ /...μέγεθός τ' 263-4** most MSS. read ....τε...δ', which is unsatisfactory because a close link between the two subjects is indicated by the reference of both to **/ἀνέρος 265**, in emphatic enjambment at the end of the clause.

264 /ἄπρηκτος τελέθει ~ 6.206 /ἄ-ον τ.

264 εἰς οὐδὲν ἀέξει is best taken as an example of Q.'s possibly novel use of act. ἀέξω in the intrans. sense of 'grow', 'increase' (10x), on the analogy of intrans. αὐξάνω; thus Combellack, "comes to nothing."

265 πινυτὴ...μῆτις seems to reflect a traditional interpretation of the H. noun πινυτή (cf. Hesychius—σύνεσις, φρόνησις), which Q. does not use. In H. adj. π. is applied only to persons, but in Q. also to θυμός 3.255, νόημα 12.525, φρένες 6.27.

266-7 forms an emphatic climax to this part of the speech, with Odysseus claiming that his qualities are a divine benefit for the Greeks.

266 μῆτιν after μῆτις 265 recalls the same at 244-5.

266 κάρτος as distinguished here from μῆτις = 'physical strength', whilst κράτος 262 has the more abstract sense of 'power'.

In the rest of his speech, **268-90**, Odysseus answers Ajax's accusations point by point in the same order, omitting only the claim that the armour would not fit him (224-8); see 237-90n.

268-75 Odysseus refutes at some length Ajax's claim to have rescued him from the Trojans in battle (200-10), with verbal echoes: **268 πάρος φεύγοντα σάωσας** ~ 203 and 205, **269 δηίου ἐξ ἐνοπῆς** ~ 205, **273 ἀνὰ μόθον** = 204.

268 ὥς σύ μ' ἔφησθα For the sake of juxtaposition of pronouns μ' is removed from the main clause to which it belongs.

269 /δηίου ἐξ ἐνοπῆς ~ /δ. ἐκ πολέμοιο 5x in H., /Τρώων ἐξ ἐ. 2x in H., 7.247 /δήιον εἰς ἐνοπήν. δ. is treated as a two-termination adj., as δάιος is sometimes in tragedy.

270 ἐπεσσυμένους The participle is H. and much used by Q. (47x). For the variant -ως in MS. P and other occurrences of the same see 92n.; -ους is clearly correct here.

270 Τρῶας...ἔμπεδον ~ O406 T. ἐπερχομένους μ. ἔ.

270 οἱ δ' ἐπέχυντο/ = O654, 2.196 (but both times with τοὶ), ~ Π295, 8.386.

271 κάρτεϊ χειρῶν/ = Θ226, Λ9, ~ 3.314; it emphasises Odysseus' physical strength, proving the point made at 266-7.
272 θυμὸν ἔλυσα = 1.762; ~ 3.162, 307 θ. ἔλυσε(ν). It is a variation on the H. expressions with λύω and objects γυῖα and γούνατα = 'weaken', 'kill'. Q. avoids λ. with γυῖα, but has it with γούνατα, ἅψεα, ἦτορ.
272 Σὺ δ'...βάζεις/ ~ Δ355 σὺ δὲ ταῦτ' ἀνεμώλια β./. Of the H. neut. pl. objects of βάζω Q. uses ἀνεμώλια, ἄρτια, πεπνυμένα as well as seven non-H. ones.
272 οὐκ ἄρ' ἐτήτυμα is a fourth-foot trochaic caesura, repeated with variation from 2.20; see 209n.
For **ἀνὰ μόθον 273** see 204n.
The emphasis of **σοὶ αὐτῷ/ 273** is increased by enjambment and separation of **ἦρα φέρων 274**. For the latter expression see 163n.; it is doubtful whether Vian and Battegay (ἦρα 2) are justified in identifying the slightly different meaning 'porter secours à' here and 3.110.
274 δουρὶ δαμάσσῃ/ ~ ten line ends in H. with δουρί and metrically equivalent forms of δαμάω, elsewhere in Q. only 7.104.
275 φεύγοντ', applied to Ajax, echoes the same word at 205, 268 and 269 applied to Odysseus. Vian defends its consistency with ἔστης 274 in terms of the manner of Ajax's retreat described Λ 544-74, but notes (after West) that it can be understood as equivalent to a hypothetical clause, "if you were to flee", after μή.. .274.
275-8 Odysseus answers Ajax's accusation at 211-4 that Odysseus beached his ships in the central position out of cowardice, with verbal echoes: **275 Νέας...ἔρυσσα** ~ 212, 213-4, **276 περιτρομέων** ~ 214, **278 ἔκτοσθε...νέας** ~ 213-4. Odysseus' alleged motive of facilitating access to the commanders for advice was perhaps suggested by the statement at Λ 806-8 that assemblies and trials were held beside Odysseus' ships.
276 περιτρομέων Q.'s use of act. π. 4x as a trans. verb may be original (see LSJ s.v.).
276 δηΐων μένος Vian and Battegay classify this use of μ. as periphrastic, for which see 22n. The only similar H. expression is μ. ἀνδρῶν B387, which Q. uses 2x and the equivalent βροτῶν μ. 1x.
276-7 μῆχος/...φέρωμαι/ ~ μ./ εὑρέμεναι 2x in H. and 1x in Q., μ./εὕρωμεν 2x in Q.; noteworthy here is the emphatic separation of noun and verb.
277 ὑπὲρ πολέμοιο ~ 281 ὑ. πολέμου = 'about, concerning war'. This use of ὑπέρ like περί plus gen. is hardly H., though Z524 ὑ. σέθεν may be an example. In Q. it is quite common (see Vian and Battegay s.v. II B2) and may well show the influence of prose usage.
278-81 Odysseus briefly departs from his answers to Ajax's accusations in order to claim credit for an exploit not mentioned by Ajax, his disguising himself with self-inflicted maltreatment and entering Troy to obtain

information. This is closely modelled on the H. version, told by Helen to Telemachus δ244-58, with verbal echoes: **279 αὐτὸν...λευγαλέῃσιν** ~ δ244 αὐτόν μιν πληγῇσιν ἀεικελίῃσι δαμάσσας, and **280-1 ὄφρα...ἀλεγεινοῦ** corresponding in meaning with δ258 κατὰ δὲ φρόνιν ἤγαγε πολλήν. In Antisthenes' version Ajax (6) cites the incident to Odysseus' discredit as demeaning, to which Odysseus responds briefly (3 and 8). Ovid omits it altogether. Q. has Odysseus mention it on his own initiative as evidence for his self-sacrificing endurance. The traditional timing of the exploit is later than the present episode, shortly before the construction of the wooden horse. Q. appears to have reproduced a mistake originally made by a source which, like Antisthenes or Ovid, treated this episode alone, without reference to the larger narrative (thus Vian, *Rech.* 44).

280 /ἐς Τρώων πτολίεθρον = 13.59; ~ Τρώων (...) πόλιν(-ς) 10 x in H., avoided by Q.; ~ Τροίης...πτολίεθρον α2.

280-1 ὄφρα...μητιόωνται ~ K207-8 πύθοιτο /ἅσσα τε μητιόωσι; partly = 471 /ὁ. μ. Use of the subjunctive in a final clause in historic sequence is abnormal but not unparalleled in H.; see Monro, *GHD* 298. In Q. it is mostly preferred to the optative; see Koechly, *prol.* LXXXVI-LXXXVII.

281 μητιόωνται (present) is to be preferred to μητιόωντο (imperf.) of the *recentiores* because the latter gives unacceptable hiatus (see Vian, *Rech.* 215). Therefore ὁππόσα κτλ. must be taken as an indirect question with pres. indicative in historic sequence. That is contrary to H. usage, which is unlike Attic in that the pres. indic. of direct speech becomes imperf. in indirect speech after a historic tense; see Monro, *GHD* 270. Q. is obviously influenced by Attic usage, perhaps encouraged in this case by the preceding use of the subjunctive in a final clause. The matter seems not to have received comment before.

282-4 Οὐδὲ...ἐδείδιον directly contradicts 217 σὺ δὲ...αἰεί, Ajax's claim that Odysseus was always afraid of Hector. As proof Odysseus refers to his response, together with eight other Greek leaders, to Hector's challenge as narrated H 161-9, which is cited in a somewhat different way in Ovid's version (275-9).

283 ἐν πρώτοις Odysseus is made to put himself in the best light in spite of the H. account. According to Vian this actually contradicts the naming of Odysseus as the last of the volunteers H168. But it is not clear that the order of names there is significant, all of them being shamefully slow after Menelaus.

283 ἀνόρουσα...μενεαίνων/ ~ ἐπόρουσε κατακτάμεναι μ./ 2x in H., ἐ. δαϊζέμεναι μ./ 1x in H. μ. at the line end is frequent in H. and Q. (8x).

For **ἠνορέῃ πίσυνος 284** see 223n.

284 προκαλέσσατο πάντας/ ~ H285 πρ. π. ἀρίστους/, said by Ajax of Hector's challenge.

285-6 Odysseus contradicts Ajax's claims to the main role in rescuing the body and armour of Achilles, 183-6 and 218-22, with verbal echoes: **285 ἀμφ' Ἀχιλῆι** = 219, and **286 ἐσάωσα δ'...θανόντα** ~ 221-2. The last statement is very similar to his claim in Ovid's version at 280-5, esp. 284-5 "ego corpus Achillis / et simul arma tuli." ἐσάωσα is less precise than 'tuli', but later Q. uses an exact equivalent of the latter when Odysseus makes the same claim to Neoptolemus, 7.208-9 νέκυν ποτὶ νῆας ἔνεικα. The earliest appearance of this version of the event is Sophocles, *Phil.* 373, the words of Odysseus reported by Neoptolemus to Philoctetes, ἐγὼ γὰρ αὔτ' (sc. τὰ τεύχη) ἔσωσα κἀκεῖνον παρών, where the same verb is used as in the present passage. Whether or not this version was earlier presented as a lie on Odysseus' part, it is certainly so presented by Q., because it flagrantly contradicts his own narrative of the event 3.212-387. Thus its effect here is to present Odysseus in the worst possible light. The fullest treatment of the matter is by Vian, *Rech.* 43.
Instead of **δέ σευ 285**, adopted by all editors, read the emphatic δὲ σεῦ, anticipating the comparative statement.
285 Ἀχιλῆι πολὺ is Rhodomann's emendation, accepted by all later editors, of Ἀχιλῇ or -εῖ πολλῷ in all MSS. except P, which gives -ῆι πολλῷ *contra metrum*. The emendation should be accepted because the dat. Ἀχιλῆι occurs 12x in Q., his only other dat. form being Ἀχιλλεῖ (1x).
287-9 Odysseus asserts that he is not afraid of Ajax's spear in terms that echo with rhetorical point his claim as regards Hector's spear—**287 Οὐδὲ μὲν...σέθεν, ἀλλά....** ~ 282 Οὐδὲ μὲν...ἐδείδιον, ἀλλὰ... The following contrasted statement that he is suffering from a wound incurred in the defence of Achilles and his armour implies that otherwise he would be ready to fight Ajax for the prize. This implies an interpretation of Ajax's comments at 229-34 about the prize being for valour, not for eloquence, as amounting to a challenge to an armed contest, esp. 231 ὅς τις...χάρμῃ. Because that is no more than hinted at in the earlier passage, the reader is now prompted to reconsider its import. This slight difficulty in the narrative may well reflect the fact that, as Kakridis (60) suggests, Odysseus' excuse of a wound is an original invention of Q.'s. In Ovid's version (262-7) Odysseus simply calls attention to his own honourable wounds and contrasts Ajax's own lack of the same.
287-8 λυγρὸν / ἕλκος ~ 9.410 λ. ἕλκος/.
287-8 με...ἀμφ' ὀδύνῃς περινίσεται (on the spelling of the verb see Vian, *Rech.* 166-7), "besets me with pain", ~ 12.403 πεπαρμέναι ἀμφ' ὀδύνῃσι, 5.390 (=E399) ὀ. πεπαρμένος. These comparisons illustrate Q.'s use of ἀμφί plus dat. as = instrumental dat. περινίσομαι trans. = 'go round', 'beset', is a unique usage; the verb is otherwise only attested intrans. Cf. ἐπινίσομαι, first in Sophocles intrans., intrans. and trans. in A.R., trans. in Q.—2x = 'cross', 1x (12.463) = 'come upon', 'attack', almost a synonym of περινίσομαι here.

289 ὑπερουτηθέντα, 'wounded on account of' (LSJ), must be accepted; the variant ὕπερ ο. is incompatible with the preceding εἵνεκα plus gen. The compound verb is a *hapax*, as is Q.'s κατουταμένης 14.318. Both are remarkable coinages, because no other compound is attested from οὐτάω, which is frequent in H. and Q. Koechly construes ὑπερ- with both the preceding gen. and the following gen., accepting Rhodomann's emendation <τ'> after **δαϊκταμένου 289**. In this he is followed by all later editors and translators despite the awkward redundancy of having both εἵνεκα and ὑπερ-, admitted by Koechly. The analogous compounds ὑπερθνῄ/σκω and ὑπερμάχομαι indicate the simple gen. as the proper construction with ὑπερουτάω. This is achieved by restoring the MSS.' text without <τ'>, pausing after the enjambment τευχέων / τῶνδ' and construing ὑ. exclusively with the following gen. <τ'> is not required for metre, because hiatus of a long vowel in the *princeps* is common in Q.; see Koechly, *prol.* XXXVII-XXXVIII. The phrase δαϊκταμένου 'Αχιλῆος/ is used also 3.709, 4.29.

290 Odysseus follows the example of Ajax in ending with a short and abrupt assertion of his family connection with Achilles; see 235-6n. He does so in terms strikingly similar to those used by Odysseus in Ovid's version: 142-3, "nostri quoque sanguinis auctor / Iuppiter est."

291-317: The Second Speeches of Ajax and Odysseus

291 Introductory line—Ajax replies. 292-5 Neither Ajax nor any other Greek saw Odysseus at work when the Trojans tried to take Achilles' body. 295-7 Ajax then killed some Trojans and put others to flight. 297-301 Like geese or cranes attacked by an eagle, the Trojans fled from Ajax to their city. 302-5 Odysseus must have been fighting in a different part of the battle at that time, not near Achilles. 306 Introductory line—Odysseus replies. 307-11 Odysseus does not yield to Ajax either in intelligence or in physical strength; in the former he is far superior and in the latter he is at least a match. 311-2 The Trojans know that and tremble at the sight of Odysseus. 313-6 Ajax learnt the strength of Odysseus when they wrestled together at the funeral games of Patroclus. 317 Closing line.

Ajax devotes the whole of his second speech to enlarging on his own achievement in defending the body and armour of Achilles and Odysseus' failure to do so, which he first stated at 183-6. This is natural given the matter at issue and in view of the fact that the weakest point in Odysseus' main speech is his contradiction of Ajax's claims at 285-6, but the effect is rather laboured. Odysseus does not attempt to answer him directly, which gives the impression of his being uncomfortably aware that he cannot do so. Instead he reverts to his general claim to intellectual superiority, without argument, adding a new claim to be at least Ajax's equal physically. This he supports with a recollection designed to embarrass Ajax, the H. account of their wrestling match Ψ 700-39, in which Odysseus got the better, although it was judged a tie.

291 Ὣς ἄρ' ἔφη occurs only 2x in H., but 19x in Q.

291 τὸν δ' αὖτις ἀμείβετο = 4.102, which are the only occurrences of αὖ. ἀμ. in H. or Q., but cf. ο439 αὖτις μετέειπε...καὶ ἀμ. For the form αὖτις see 62n.

292 Ὦ Ὀδυσεῦ...πάντων ~ Α 122 Ἀτρείδη κύδιστε, φιλοκτεανώτατε πάντων. Voc. δολομῆτα occurs in H. only Α540, used by Hera to insult Zeus; otherwise δ. is used 6x in H. of Aegisthus and Clytaemnestra. Here it is substituted for Odysseus' regular H. epithet πολύμητις, which Q. avoids as such, only using it 12.154 of Athena. For ἀργαλ. see 240-2n.

293 σ' ἐκεῖσ' should perhaps be read as σε κεῖσ', because κεῖσε is the only H. form (but see Vian, *Rech.* 161); otherwise in Q. cf. 9.214, where it has the proper meaning 'thither' with a verb of motion. Here κεῖσε must = ἐκεῖ, κεῖθι. Thus Zimmermann conjectures κεῖθ', which is dubious because it does not occur elsewhere in Q. Q. possibly saw H. precedent at Μ348, where Zenodotus read κἀκεῖσε for καὶ κεῖθι. More probably he was influenced by later prose, where occasionally ἐκεῖσε = ἐκεῖ; see LSJ s.v. II and F. Spitzner, *Observationes crit. et gramm. in Q.S. Posthom.*, Lipsiae 1839. Vian says the statement would be clearer with following correlative ὅθι instead of **ὅτε 294**. But the reference of κεῖσ' alone is sufficiently clear from the context.

293 πονεύμενον referring to Odysseus is pointedly echoed by πονεύμενος 304 and so is preferable to the variant π-ος referring to Ajax.

293-4 ἄλλος / Ἀργείων ~ 259-60.

295 /ἐλκέμεναι μενέαινον ~ Σ156 /ἑ μεμαώς, Σ176 /ἑ. μέμονε. The addition of **καὶ ἀλκῇ 295** to instrumental **ὑπὸ δουρὶ** has no obvious H. precedent; in Q. cf. δ. καὶ ἠνορέῃ 9.342, 13.302.

296 τῶν μὲν...οὓς δ' Use of an oblique case of ὅς as a demonstrative pronoun is almost unparalleled in Q., but cf. ὧν δὲ 13.97, where editors prefer τῶν, and 14.594.

For **γούνατ' ἔλυσα 296** see 272n.

For **κατὰ μόθον 296** see 204n.

297 /αἰὲν ἐπεσσύμενος ~ 270.

297 φοβέοντο/ echoes ἐφόβησα/ 296 and leads into a brief simile of an attack by an eagle on feeding geese and cranes, which is modelled on that at Ο 690-2: **298 χήνεσιν ἢ γεράνοισιν** ~ Ο 692 χηνῶν ἢ γεράνων ἢ κύκνων, **298 ἐπορούσῃ** ~ Ο 691 ἐφορμᾶται, **299 πεδίον κάτα βοσκομένοισιν/** ~ Ο 691 ποταμὸν πάρα βοσκομενάων/, which supports κάτα, not κατα- as in the MSS. We are perhaps intended to recall the contrast between the present context and that in H., the attack of Hector on the Greek ships defended by Ajax. Q.'s simile at 13.104-7 has partly the same subject, but different development.

Vian supports his emendation **οἷς <τ'> 298** (adopted by Pompella) for the MSS.' οἷς on the ground that in the similes of Q. general relative

clauses are introduced with ὅς τε, not ὅς, unless required by metre. He likewise emends two other exceptions to this rule, 8.90 and 9.474.

299 ἠιόεν πεδίον is one of Q.'s two notable uses of the H. gloss ἠ., which in its only H. occurrence, E36 ἠιόεντι Σκαμάνδρῳ, is of disputed meaning; see LSJ s.v. Q.'s other use, 1.283 ἠιόεντα Πάνορμον, is taken as supporting derivation from ἠιών = 'shore', 'bank'. In the present passage Way translates ἠ. 'grassy' and is followed by Vian and Pompella, which may be seen as consistent with the alternative derivation from ἦια = 'chaff'. But the fact that πεδίον replaces ποταμόν in the H. model indicates association with ἠιών; thus Combellack "by the banks of a river", Lehrs "iuxta ripas".

300 θοὸν ἄορ/ = 14.305, ~ 13.185, 403; the combination is not H. In H. θ. = 'swift', except ο299 νήσοισιν...θοῇσιν, where the traditional interpretation is 'sharp'; cf. ι327 ἐθόωσα = 'sharpened'. Later poets, esp. A.R., occasionally use θ. = 'sharp', and this is the natural interpretation of Q.'s application of it not only to ἄορ, but also to αἰγανέῃσι, ἀξίνῃσι, βουπλῆγες, δόρυ, and possibly to βέλος and χερμαδίοισι. This meaning, however, is not recognised by Vian and Battegay, though it is by Pompella (*Index*).

301 / Ἴλιον ἐς = 7.263; / Ἴ. εἰς 9x in H.

301 κατέδυσαν occurs in this *sedes* 4x in Q. The last two considerations count against Koechly's adoption of the variant ἐσκατέδυσαν. Q. has no other compound in ἐσ(εἰσ)κατα-, but cf. Z74 = P320 / Ἴλιον εἰσανέβησαν.

301 ἀλευάμενοι μέγα πῆμα/ = 3.361, ~ 3x in Q. ἀ. βαρὺ π./; ~ O223 ἀλευάμενος χόλον αἰπύν/, Y281 ἀ. δόρυ μακρόν/.

302 Σοὶ...κάρτος ἐπήλυθεν ~ λ200 μοι νοῦσος ἐ. (cf. μ311 τοῖσιν ἐ....ὕπνος), 9.355 σφίσι θάμβος ἐ. (cf. 13.393 τῷ...θάμβος...ἐ.), the verb being always in the same *sedes*. Q.'s expressions differ slightly from H.'s in referring to emotions, so that his use of the verb is akin to the post-H. sense 'occur (mentally)'; see LSJ s.v. I 3.

303 /μάρναο δυσμενέεσιν (μ. imperfect) ~ O475 /μ. τε Τρώεσσι (μ. imperative).

303 καὶ αὐτὸς/ If καὶ is understood as 'also', κ. α. must qualify the whole statement ἑκὰς....πονεύμενος with the implication 'as well as I', which is nonsense. Therefore καὶ must link αὐτὸς...πονεύμενος with ἑκὰς, and αὐτὸς = 'by yourself'. This is the positive counterpart of 293 οὐ...πονεύμενον, serving as a link with the opening denial.

305 /ἀντιθέου Ἀχιλῆος = 12.288, ~ 4.385, 14.276. ἀντ. is not H. with 'A.; for its use in Q. see 158n.

For **δῆρις ὀρώρει/ 305** see 219n.

306 Ὀδυσῆος...κερδαλέον κῆρ/ ~ δ270 Ὀδυσσῆος ταλασίφρονος...φίλον κῆρ/, 1.759 'Ο. ταλαὸν κῆρ/, 5.468

'Οδυσσέος ἀργαλέον κῆρ/. Periphrasis of κῆρ and gen. of proper name occurs otherwise in H. 2x, with λάσιον κ./ B851, Π554; otherwise in Q. with φίλον κ. 7.684, κρατερὸν κ. 14.180. Q.'s revival of the H. type is remarkable. κερδαλέον κ. was also influenced by voc. κερδαλεόφρον/ Δ339 of Odysseus (also A149 of Agamemnon).

307-8 ἐγὼν..βίην makes essentially the same claims as 266-7, though in a negative and comparative form.

307 ἔλπομαι εἶναι/ = 2.37, 4.96; not in H.

308 εἰ καὶ presents a condition as immaterial even if fulfilled; contrast καὶ εἰ 302, καὶ ἦν 312, and see LSJ καί B8.

308 φαίδιμός with reference to Ajax reflects the formula φ. Αἴας/, 5x in H. of Telamonian Ajax, 1x in Q., 3.431; cf. φ. ἀνήρ 624, also of Ajax. φ. occurs only 7x altogether in Q.

309-11 νόῳ μὲν...βίῃ δέ follows the use of the same nouns in 308; the variant νόον is obviously a corruption from the latter. The first half of the statement echoes that made by Odysseus at 241-2.

309 ἔγωγε...εἰμι ~ θ 221 ἐμέ φημι πολὺ προφερέστερον εἶναι, said by Odysseus. For the combination of πρ. with νόῳ cf. 12.275 (see Campbell *ad loc.*).

310 σεῖο μετ' 'Αργείοισι is naturally understood as "than you among the Greeks"; thus Combellack. But Vian translates "je te surpasse...comme le restant des Argiens", which involves μετά plus dat. = 'including', like σύν sometimes in Attic, but that occurs in H. only with an ordinal number or equivalent; see LSJ μετά B II.

310 κεν implies a change from εἰμί to εἴην, which Koechly regards as intolerable and emends to τοι (also Zimmermann). Vian and Pompella accept κεν, and Vian and Battegay understand εἰμί from the preceding clause, but that would be unparalleled. In any case the construction is abnormal, perhaps intended as informality of speech. It presents the more hazardous claim in a less positive form.

310 ἀμφήριστος of Odysseus = 'evenly matched', slightly different from its only H. use, 2x in the account of the funeral games, Ψ382 = 527 ἀμφήριστον ἔθηκεν, of a contest = 'disputed', 'doubtful'. Q. in his account of the games for Achilles uses ἀ. first 4.197 in the H. sense, then 4.309 of a person as here.

The addition of **ἀγαυότερος 311**, seemingly as an afterthought, echoes Ajax's use of the same at 235, with rhetorical point.

311-2 Odysseus' mention of the fear of the Trojans for him amounts to an artful appeal to the Trojan judges and foreshadows the shortly following statement of their judgement in his favour 318-20. It is also a reference on Q.'s part to the traditional version of the story in which the Trojans were asked who had harmed them most; see 121-79n. This final statement of Odysseus' status in warfare echoes, without actually answering, Ajax's final charge—cf. **ἀπάτερθεν 312** and ἑκὰς 303.

313 σάφα οἶδας σ. οἶδα *et sim.* occurs in H. 4x in this *sedes*; in Q. also 6.60.
The difficulty of taking **ἠδὲ καὶ ἄλλοι 313** as parenthetic, with the main construction οἶδας...μογήσας unaffected by it, is only slight and does not justify emendation like Zimmermann's ἀλκὴν for ἄλλοι.
314 παλαισμοσύνῃ πολυτειρέι = 4.120 in Q.'s narrative of the funeral games; ~ Ψ701 π-ης ἀλεγεινῆς in the passage that is referred to here. Q. also uses πο. with βιότοιο 13.281. It may well be his coinage, not to be confused with Aratus' πολυτειρής < τείρεα = 'stars'; the only other compound with -τειρής < τείρω is the H. ἀτειρής, which Q. uses 25x.
314 πολλὰ μογήσας/ = 1.76, 12x in H.. There is perhaps intended alliteration and assonance in 314.
315 δαϊκταμένου Πατρόκλοιο ~ 289.
316 ~ Ψ700 Π. δ' αἶψ' ἄλλα κατὰ τρίτα θῆκεν ἄεθλα, in the passage that is referred to.
316 /Πηλείδης ἐρίθυμος = 1.742, 756, ~ Φ 153 Πηλείδη μεγάθυμε. μ. is the epithet of Achilles several times in H., never in Q., who only uses μ. 8x altogether, but the synonym ἐ., which he may have coined, 13x. It is noteworthy that Achilles is mentioned at the end of this speech as he is in the preceding three speeches.
316 ἀγακλυτὰ...ἄεθλα ~ 4.457 ἀ. τεύχεα, Q.'s only other use of ἀ.
317 = 598, ~ 4.125 Λ. κλ. π., ~ 5.420, 6.71 Λ. π., ~ ω192 ὄλβιε Λ. πάι, πολυμήχαν' Ὀδυσσεῦ.

318-332: The Judgement and its Immediate Impact

The passing of judgement by the Trojans in favour of Odysseus is stated with the utmost economy 318-20, as are the contrasted reactions of Odysseus and the Greek army 321. The army's negative reaction indicates that Ajax enjoyed its sympathy no less than that of Q., in keeping with the statement of his preeminence 130-2. Then, in sharp contrast to this brevity, 322-9 describe Ajax's reaction in graphic and quasi-scientific detail, which implies that his condition is pathological. Ajax's withdrawal led by his companions, 329-32, is accompanied by explicit foreshadowing of his impending death. The whole is an impressive piece of writing.

318-9 Καὶ τότε.../αἰζηῶν is a slight elaboration of Odysseus' statement of this event λ547 παῖδες δὲ Τρώων δίκασαν, with significant omission of καὶ Παλλὰς Ἀθήνη, which reflects Q.'s minimisation of divine intervention in general and of Athena's role in this particular episode, esp. her traditional hostility towards Ajax, but cf. 360 ff. For **Τρώιοι υἷες 318** see 177n.
The change from the H. δίκασαν to middle **δικάσαντ'(ο) 318** is eccentric and justified by nothing more than metrical convenience. H. observes the later distinction between act. δικάζω = 'give judgement' and

middle -ομαι = 'seek judgement', of parties in a dispute; cf. esp. λ545 ἐγὼ νίκησα δικαζόμενος. Q.'s only other use of δ. is act. at 157.

/αἰζηῶν **319** is unusual in denoting two individuals; the plural of ἀ. in H. and Q. is normally used of men in general. Curiously Q. seems to have been influenced by μ440 κρίνων νείκεα πολλὰ δικαζομένων αἰζηῶν.

319-20 νίκην...'Οδυσῆι The nature of the judgement is specified with careful attention to word order, esp. postponement of the name to the end for the sake of suspense. Emphasis on the unanimity of the Trojans highlights the following conflict.

319 νίκην...καὶ...τεύχεα is a natural hendiadys.

For **ἄμβροτα τ. 319** see 2n.

320 ἐυπτολέμῳ 'Οδυσῆι/ = 12.52, Odysseus being the only individual to whom Q. applies ἐ. apart from Achilles (6x); see 174n.

321 The parallel between the contrasted statements is underlined by a double rhyme; there is a subtle difference between the contrasted verbs in that **στονάχησε 321** denotes the outward expression of emotion.

321 γήθησε νόος recalls Nestor's prediction γηθήσει κατὰ θυμόν 146.

321 στονάχησε δὲ λαός/ ~ 12.415 Περιστενάχιζε δὲ λαός/ in a passage closely related to this; see 322-9n. Sympathy for Ajax is only implied here, whilst 12.415-6 that for Laocoön is explicit, οἰκτείρων φίλον ἄνδρα.

322-9 The effect of the judgement on Ajax is described in remarkable physiological detail. This is framed by an initial statement that he was metaphorically 'frozen', **Παχνώθη 322**, and a more elaborate concluding statement that he stood immovable with eyes fixed on the ground, **'Επὶ χθόνα...ἐναλίγκιος 328-9**. His condition is first defined as an attack of ἄτη, **αἶψα...περικάππεσε 322-3**, where ἄτη denotes the condition of 'mental blindness' (thus Combellack but not Vian); see 164n. and F.A. García Romero, "La intervencion psiquica en los *PH* de Q. de Esmirna", *Habis* 17 [1986] 111. The physical symptoms are then described 323-8: heating of the blood, invasion of the liver by gall, pain or grief (ἄχος) in the heart, sharp pain in the membranes, 'meninges', at the base of the brain, and mental confusion. This reflects two matters in standard medical theory. First is the Hippocratic theory of the four humours, the proportions of which determine human temperament. Preponderance of yellow bile, ξανθὴ χολή, produces a choleric temperament, and in this case it affects the liver, ἧπαρ, which was commonly regarded as the seat of passions; see LSJ s.v. Secondly, investigation of the nervous system by Herophilus and Erasistratus (III B.C.) had led to some understanding of the function of the brain, in particular of its occipital lobes. Precise mention of the second matter is included by A.R. in his description of Medea's emotional condition 3.761-5; see comments *ad loc.* by R.L. Hunter (ed. 1989). That almost certainly influenced Q., though he avoids similarity of

expression. There is close similarity to the present passage in the mention of the same matter in Q.'s later, remarkably precise and detailed, description of the onset of glaucoma in Laocoön, 12.399-415, a feature of the story that is unique to Q.; see comments *ad loc.* by Vian and Campbell. **326-7 καὶ δριμὺ...ἄλγος** ~ 12.405-6 ἄχος δ' ἀλεγεινὸν ἵκανεν / ἄχρι καὶ ἐς μήνιγγας ἰδ' ἐγκεφάλοιο θέμεθλα. Cf. also **328 /σὺν δ'...ἀνδρός** with 12.402 /σὺν δ' ἔχεεν...ὄμματα φωτός. Sources have not been identified for either the present passage or 12.399-415, but together they constitute impressive evidence of Q.'s interest in medical science. As noted by Hunter *loc. cit.*, anatomical precision is already a feature of the *Iliad*, but with his incorporation of medical knowledge and exclusion of supernatural elements Q. goes considerably further than A.R. in modernising H. In conclusion it should be noted that this description of the onset of mental illness has no close similarity to any other extant poetic descriptions of similar conditions; cf. e.g. Euripides, *Her.* 931-5 and see Bond (ed. 1981) *ad loc.* But there is evidence that Q. derived at least the germ of his description from early-epic versions of the story: *Ilioupers.* frag. 1.7-8 (Davies), of Machaon, ὅς ῥα καὶ Αἴαντος πρῶτος μάθε χωομένοιο / ὄμματά τ' ἀστράπτοντα βαρυνόμενόν τε νόημα.

322 /Παχνώθη...σθένος ~ A.R. 4.1279 /π. κραδίη. π. occurs 2x in early epic, metaphorically with ἦτορ, and 2x elsewhere in Q. with θυμός.

322 Αἴαντος ἐῢ σθένος = 424; for the periphrasis see 4n.

322-3 αὐτῷ / ἄτῃ...περικάππεσε ~ 469 με κακῇ περικάββαλεν ἄτῃ, where, however, ἄ. = 'disaster' (see 164n.). With both these syncopated double compound verbs Q. closely follows A.R.: περικάππεσε(ν) 2x in A.R., -ε/-ον 7x in Q.; περικάββαλον 1x in A.R., -ε 2x in Q.; also περικάτθετο 1x each in A.R. and Q. Such close imitation with a rare type of verb is striking evidence of Q.'s careful study of A.R.

324 ἔζεσε...αἷμα ~ ἔζεεν α. 3.140, 163, 6.461; for the metaphorical use of ζέω see LSJ s.v. 3.

324 ὑπερέβλυσεν ~ 11.192 -αν in the same *sedes*. ὑ. occurs only in prose before Q., but the simple βλύζω / βλύω as well as the compounds ἀνα- and περι- are all used by both A.R. and Q.

325-7 περὶ κραδίην...ἄλγος The statement that 'painful grief' entered the heart is elaborated in scientific terms as suffusion of the meninges with 'sharp pain'. The parallel is emphasised by the conclusions ἷξεν ἄχος and ἀμφήλυθεν ἄλγος, and variety of structure is obtained by emphatic separation of δριμὺ from its noun.

325 ἀλεγεινὸν/ after ἀλεγεινήν/ 318 is more likely to be accidental than for intended effect.

326 ἐγκεφάλοιο θεμέθλων/ ~ Ξ493 ὀφθαλμοῖο θέμεθλα/, P47 στομάχοιο θ./, 2.542 στέρνοιο θ./, 11.45 κροτάφοιο θ./.

The sentence concludes with a succinct statement of the consequent medical condition: **328 σὺν δ' ἔχεεν νόον** ~ ω358 σὺν δὲ...νόος χύτο, 2.277 σύγχυτο θυμός.
328 'Επὶ...πῆξας/ ~ Γ217 κατὰ χθονὸς ὄ. π./; for the gesture generally see R. L. Hunter on A.R. 3.22 (ed. 1989).
Although **ἀχνύμενοί 330** is read by all editors, most MSS. have -όν. Corruption either way would be easy: - όν would give better balance between one participle with the object and another, παρηγορέοντες 331, with the subject; on the other hand, its application to Ajax may seem weak after the preceding description.
330 ἐυπρῴρους ἐπὶ νῆας/ = 4.283 Q. uses ἐ. 4x (earlier 1x in Euripides), as well as the H. κυανό- 1x and τανύ-, which he may have coined, 2x.
331 /πολλὰ παρηγορέοντες = 1.777, 7.27; ~ 3.664.
331-2 ὃ δ' ὑστατίην...Μοῖρα. This foreshadowing by the poet of Ajax's imminent death is very similar to that of Paris's 10.332a, οἶμον ἐς ἐσχατίην, ὅθι μιν μόρος αἰνὸς ἄγεσκε (see G.E. Duckworth [1936] 74 n.60). Of numerous H. statements about Μοῖρα closest to 332 is N602 ἤιε· τὸν δ' ἄγε Μ. κακὴ θανάτοιο τέλοσδε. Similar statements occur in Q. 6x (2.361, 4.433, 6.561, 7.247, 8.323, 10.109).
332 /ἤιεν οὐκ ἐθέλων = 10.264; ~ *H.h. Dem.* 124 /ἤλυθον οὐκ ἐθέλουσα.
332 σχεδόθεν...Μοῖρα/ ~ σ. δέ οἱ ἦλθεν 'Αθήνη/ 3x in H.

333-351: Prelude to the Night

The episodes of the funeral games and the contest over the arms of Achilles are brought to a natural conclusion and the scene is set for the night-time activity of Ajax. The initial statement that the Greeks withdrew to their camp for supper and sleep 333-4 is picked up by the more elaborate concluding one that they slept off the effects of their supper 348-51 after the setting of the sun and the onset of the night 346-7. The intervening passage begins with the statement that Thetis returned to the sea accompanied by the other Nereids and by sea creatures 335-7, which is an appropriate counterpart to their arrival after the death of Achilles, described 3.582-94. That is followed by a curious digression linking the marriage of Thetis and Peleus to the punishment of Prometheus, which falls into two unequal halves, 338-40 and 341-5. In the first part the Nereids are said to have been angry with Prometheus because it was his prophecy that induced Zeus to give Thetis to Peleus against her will. The second part is a dramatic elaboration of this: the Nereid Cymothoe remarks that Prometheus deserved his torture, her three-line speech being framed by introductory and concluding lines. This is certainly unexpected for the context, and Vian calls it a "maladroit hors d'oeuvre mythologique", although elsewhere (II 15) he sees it in the more positive light of presenting the madness and death of Ajax as something long since predetermined. The connection is admittedly somewhat indirect, but the marriage of Thetis is referred to several times earlier by Q. (3.613-

26, 4.49-55, 131-43, 5.73-79) as the background to the life and death of Achilles. The presentation of the Prometheus myth here could reflect various sources, and there is no close similarity to A.R.'s version, 2.1247-59 (*pace* Vian). For the singling out of Cymothoe as spokesperson cf. Virgil, *Aen.* 1.144, and Valerius Flaccus, *Arg.* 2.605; in H. and Hesiod she is simply listed in catalogues of the Nereids (Σ41, *Th.* 245).

333-4 All the MSS. read ἔβη, which is incompatible with Ἀργεῖοι κτλ. Rhodomann's emendation **ἔβαν** is adopted by all editors except Koechly, who retains ἔβη with Ajax as its understood subject and supposes the loss of a line after either 333 or 334 containing the rest of the clause with Ἀργεῖοι as subject. That is preferable because it explains the text plausibly, whereas corruption of ἔβαν to ἔβη is most unlikely.

333 ἀπείρονα πόντον/ is a convincing emendation of the MSS.' ἀπειρέα π., the adj. ἀπειρής being otherwise unattested. The line end = A350 as read by Aristarchus; ~ δ510 π. ἀ., 13.481 ἀ. π. in a different *sedes*, 10.69 πόντος ἀπείρων/.

335-6 The return to the sea of Thetis and the other Nereids together may be consciously contrasted with the separate return of the latter on Thetis' instructions Σ 139-45.

335 ἔσω...κατεδύσετο πόντου ~ 14.651 κ. δ' ἔνδοθι γαίης, 14.542 κατέδυσαν ἔσω ἁλός, 4x in H. ὑπὸ (ἐς) πόντον ἐδύσετο.

336-7 ἀμφὶ δ'...οἶδμα. The accompanying of the Nereids by sea creatures, as on their arrival 3.591-2, reflects that of Poseidon N 27-28, as well as ε 421-2 κῆτος...οἷά τε πολλὰ τρέφει κλυτὸς Ἀμφιτρίτη.

For **ἁλμυρὸν οἶδμα 337** see Campbell on 12.432.

338 Προμηθέι μητιόωντι is a necessary emendation of the MSS.' -έα -α, a corruption that is hard to explain. Earlier editors follow Rhodomann with μητιόεντι, but for μητιόων as an adj. in Q. see 135n. It reflects the Hesiodic epithets of Prometheus, ἀγκυλομήτης, αἰολόμητις, ποικίλος, ποικιλόβουλος.

340 /δῶκε...ἄγεσθαι ~ /δ. δ' ἄγειν 2x in H., ὑπ' ἀνέρι δ. δαμῆναι 3.613.

341 ἐν τῇσι Vian follows Koechly and Zimmermann in emending the MSS.' ἐνὶ, which is restored by Pompella. This is one of eleven cases in Q. where both forms are admissible (see Vian and Battegay s.v.); in many of these the MSS. are divided, but here there is no reason to reject their reading. For **μέγ' ἀσχαλόωσ' 341** see 103n.

342 πήμαθ' ὑπέτλη ὑ. may have been coined by Q., who uses it 4x; cf. ἀνατλάω (in H. and Q.) and ὑποφέρω (not in Q.). πήματα is usually governed by πάσχω in H., 11x and 1x in Q. (7.279).

343 /δεσμῷ ἐν ἀρρήκτῳ = 10.201, of Prometheus.

343-4 οἱ μέγας...δύνων reflects λ 578-9 γῦπε δέ μιν ἑκάτερθε παρημένω ἧπαρ ἔκειρον / δέρτρον ἔσω δύνοντες, of the torture of

Tityus. This justifies the emendation δύνων, adopted by all editors since Koechly, in place of the MSS.' βαίνων, which is a trivialising corruption. Campbell (on 12.109-16, n.30) is alone in preferring βαίνων as "more vigorous".

For **κυανοπλοκάμοις 345** see 121n.

346 'Ηέλιος...ἀλωαὶ is an adaptation of the H. formula (7x) δύσετό τ' ἠέλιος σκιόωντό τε πᾶσαι ἀγυιαί, of which A.R. has a more elaborate version 1.450-2 (see A.W. James, "Night and Day in Epic Narrative from H. to Q. of S.", *Mus. Phil. Lond.* 3 [1978] 153-83). Further novelty is obtained here by the addition of 347 describing the onset of night.

346 /'Ηέλιος δ' ἀπόρουσεν = 3.656. This use of ἀ., which may be novel, is the counterpart of γ1 /'Η. δ' ἀνόρουσε.

346 ἐπεσκιόωντο = 14.417.

347 ἐπεκίδνατο...ἄστρα ~ B850 ὕδωρ ἐπικίδναται αἶαν, H451 (=H458) ὅσον τ' ἐπικίδναται ἠώς.

348-54 'Αργεῖοι δ'...ὕπνος / ἄμπεχεν states the contrast between the sleep of the other Greeks and the restlessness of Ajax in terms which reflect, with greater elaboration, K 1-4 Ἄλλοι μὲν παρὰ νηυσὶν.../εὗδον παννύχιοι μαλακῷ δεδμημένοι ὕπνῳ· / ἀλλ' οὐκ...'Αγαμέμνονα.../ὕπνος ἔχε γλυκερός, Ω 2-5 τοὶ μὲν δόρποιο...Αὐτὰρ 'Αχιλλεὺς...πανδαμάτωρ, Ω 677-9 ...οὐχ 'Ερμείαν ὕπνος ἔμαρπτεν. The following are similar passages in Q.— 3.656-61, 7.238-42, 10.255-9, 14.147-51, and so the present passage has virtually the status of a typical scene.

348 /'Αργεῖοι = 334 The repetition marks the beginning of the expected completion of the earlier statement, the Argives' need of sleep, after a remarkably long digression.

348 νηυσὶ τανυπρῴροισιν ~ 9.437 τ-ου νεός; for τ. see 330n. Here the phrase is a conscious variation, dictated by style, not by metre, on 330 ἐυπρῴρους ἐπὶ νῆας.

349 ὕπνῳ...ἀμβροσίῳ ~ B19 ἀ-ος...ὕπνος.

349-51 ἠδὲ καὶ οἴνῳ / ἡδέι...φέρεσκον. Introduced with emphatic enjambment of the adj., somewhat gratuitous information is added on the origin of the wine. Vian notes that Q. is likely to be reflecting some authority for the Cretan provenance of the Pramnian wine mentioned by H. (Λ639, κ235), as well as the H. presentation of Idomeneus as a privileged drinker Δ 259-63. But the primary H. model here is the curious passage H467-75 detailing the wine trade between the Greek camp and Lemnos.

350 'Ιδομενῆος ἀγαυοῦ ~ M117; on Q.'s presentation of Idomeneus see Vian, II 10 n.1.

351 ὑπὲρ πόντοιο πολυκλύστοιο ~ π-ῳ ἐνὶ πόντῳ 3x in H.; ~ 9.378 π-οιο θαλάσσης. This provides a further echo of the start of the passage, ἀπείρονα π-ν 333; see 348n.

352-394: The Night of Ajax's Madness

352-8 Ajax cannot eat or sleep; he arms himself and debates whether to attack the ships and all the Greeks or only to kill Odysseus. 359-64 Athena intervenes to protect Odysseus by making Ajax insane and diverting him from the Greeks. Ajax's movements are compared first, 364-70, to a dangerous storm at sea, which occurs when the Pleiades are setting, and secondly, 371-9, to a wild beast searching for its young, which have been killed by hunters; it is deadly for anyone who crosses its path. 379-85 Ajax's seething heart is compared to a cauldron of water kept on the boil in order to remove bristles from a pig. 386-91 Ajax's madness is compared to the sea, a storm or fire which destroys a forest. 391-4 Ajax's foaming mouth, gnashing teeth and clashing armour terrify all who see him.

Q. departs from the tradition represented by Sophocles' *Ajax* in postponing Ajax's action till the following day. His purpose must be to build up tension before the climax, whilst focusing attention on Ajax's formidable strength, mainly by means of a series of four developed similes. The first two, storm and wild beast, are applied to his movements, whilst the third and fourth, cauldron and forest fire, illustrate the intensity of his madness. The technique is distinctively H.: for comparable accumulation of similes cf. e.g. Β 455-83 and Ρ 725-53. Vian loses sight of this important consideration in his negative comment on the passage: "l'abus des comparaisons ne parvient pas à masquer la pauvreté de l'invention" (II 16). The passage also serves Q.'s purpose, which is consistently pursued, of preserving Ajax's dignity, partly by limiting Athena's role to the brief statement of her intervention at 359-64, where her motive is the positive one of saving Odysseus, not hostility towards Ajax (thus Kakridis 62 and Vian, II 15).

352-4 On H. precedents and parallels in Q. for the statement of Ajax's inability to eat or sleep see 348-54n. Change of narrative focus is highlighted by the emphatic juxtaposition **Αἴας δ' Ἀργείοισι 352.**

352-3 δόρπου...μελιηδέος...ὕπνος ~ τ551 αὐτὰρ ἐμὲ μελιηδὴς ὕπνος ἀνῆκεν, the only case of μ. with either δ. or ὕ. in H., and so probably consciously adapted by Q. in his only use of μ.

353-4 ὕπνος / ἄμπεχεν ~ ὕπνος plus ἔχω 4x in H. For the form ἄμπεχεν see 106n.

354 ἀλλ' ὅ γ' ἑοῖσιν is read by Koechly (after Spitzner) and later editors. The MSS. are divided between two unacceptable readings, ἀλλά γ' ἑοῖσιν and ἀλλὰ τεοῖσιν. The repetition of ὅ γε 356 gives appropriate emphasis.

354 δύσετο is Vian's emendation of -ατο, as he emends five other occurrences of (ἐ)δύσατο in the MSS., against one of δύσετο (2.593). Q.'s usage must be regarded as uncertain.

355 ἄσπετα πορφύρεσκεν/ ~ 13.24-25 κῆρ / ἄ. π. κατὰ φρένα, 14.41-2 ἦτορ / ἄ. π. κ. φρ., the last two being closer to the H. formula (3x) πολλὰ δέ μοι κραδίη πόρφυρε κιόντι. These parallels and Q.'s use of ἄσπετος (see 65n.) support Vian's translation here, "roulant mille

pensers", but Combellack's "brooded over unspeakable deeds" suits the context better, i.e. the choice between just two alternatives, killing the Greeks indiscriminately or Odysseus alone. Q.'s formulae, no less than H.'s, are capable of precise adaptation to context.

356-8 The dependent alternative question introduced by ἤ...ἤ..., with verbs in the deliberative subjunctive, follows H. usage (see Monro, *GHD* 280); cf. 2.21-23 and see Koechly, *prol.* XCI. Graphic elaboration of the alternative of killing Odysseus effectively foreshadows Ajax's choice.

The word order of **νῆας ἐνιπρήσῃ 356**, as opposed to the variant ἐ. ν., is supported by the usage of both H. (7x) and Q. (417, 1.368, 494, 8.501).

357 (ὑπὸ) ξίφεϊ στονόεντι/ = 13.354, 14.160; for Q.'s use of στ. see 185n.

358 δῃώσῃ μελεϊστὶ θοῶς is awkward because of the two adverbs together; hence Koechly's δ. μ. ταμών. But that involves implausible corruption, and δ. can itself mean 'tear' or 'cut'; cf. 3.411 and see LSJ s.v. I 2. See 208n. for Q.'s only other use of μ.

358 δολόεντ' 'Οδυσῆα/ ~ 449; in H. δ. is applied to Calypso and Circe, not to Odysseus. See 292n. on 'Ο. δολομῆτα; the application of both adjs. reflects Q.'s negative characterisation of Odysseus.

359-60 In this statement of Ajax's possession by madness, λύσσα, at the hands of Athena, personification of λ. is not explicit, any more than at 405 and 466; cf. the distinction made by Vian and Battegay s.v. But in the statement of its removal by Athena, 451-5, personification of the synonym μανίη is made undeniable by descriptive elaboration. In any case, the present introduction of λ. in the post-H. sense of madness caused by a deity (see LSJ s.v.) inevitably recalls Euripides' presentation of Λύσσα as a stage character acting for a malevolent deity, *Her.* 822 ff.

359 Καὶ τὰ μὲν ὣς ὥρμαινε is formulaic in Q. (6x), a variation on the H. /ἧος ὁ ταῦθ' ὥ. (8x).

359-60 τὰ δὴ...Λύσσαν is possibly a conscious reflection of Sophocles, *Aj.* 45 κἂν ἐξεπράξατ', εἰ κατημέλησ' ἐγώ. The omission of κε or ἄν in a main clause with aor. indicative expressing an unfulfilled condition is abnormal syntax, as noted by Koechly (*prol.* XC-XCI), who cites two other examples in Q. with aor. indicative and τάχα, 3.514 ff. and 6.503 ff. For other cases of omission of ἄν with aor. or imperf. indicative see Kühner-Gerth 393.1. There seems to be no clear precedent for the present usage; the H. examples alleged by Chantraine (*GH* II 335) are dubious. Evidence of the same licence elsewhere in late epic is provided by Keydell, who cites six examples of similar omission of κε or ἄν in Nonnus' *Dionysiaca* (ed. [1959] I, *prol.* 71-72). For further references see Vian, A.R. ed. III (1981) 42n.5.

360 Τριτωνὶς both here and 451 denotes Athena. Q. uses T. 8x as equivalent to the H. Τριτογένεια, which he uses 11x; in this sense T. occurs first in A.R.

361-2 κήδετο...ἔρεξε Athena's care for Odysseus is expressed in conventional H. terms of return for regular sacrifices; cf. e.g. Χ 169-72, Zeus and Hector, and α 59-62, Zeus, Athena and Odysseus. ἔρεξε(ν) is Struve's palmary emendation of the MSS.' ὄρεξεν.

361 πολυτλήτου 'Οδυσῆος For π. see 45n. The contrast between this application of π. to Odysseus and that of δολόεις 358 shows contextual sensitivity in the use of epithets, reflecting viewpoints independent of the narrator's.

363-4 There is economy in the narrative: 355-8 Ajax considers the alternatives of killing Greeks generally or Odysseus alone; 359-62 Athena intervenes out of concern for Odysseus; her intervention diverts Ajax's anger from the Greeks in general (cf. Sophocles, *Aj.* 51 ff.).

There is subtle alliteration and assonance in **μεγάλοιο ...Τελαμωνιάδαο 363**. The form of the patronymic is H., but less frequent in H. than Τελαμώνιος, whereas Q. prefers the longer form (5x : 2x).

364 The strong sense pause in mid verse reflects the change in Ajax, with the final ἀπ' 'Αργείων picking up 'Αργείοισι 352.

364-9 The simile of a storm at sea is essentially a more elaborate version of that at 1.355-6, with verbal correspondences: **364-5 λαίλαπι ἶσος / σμερδαλέῃ** ~ 1.355 λαίλαπι κυανέῃ ἐναλίγκιον, **369 μέμηνε...πόντος** ~ 1.355-6 ἐνὶ πόντῳ / μαίνεθ'. That simile, like the present one, also specifies the time of year with an astronomical observation (remarkably developed in the present case), there borrowed from Aratus (see Vian *ad loc.* and *Comp.* 40-41, as also for all Q.'s similes of storms at sea), here paraphrased from Hesiod: **367-8 Πληιὰς...'Ωρίωνα** ~ *Op.* 619-20 εὖτ' ἂν Πληιάδες σθένος ὄβριμον 'Ωρίωνος / φεύγουσαι πίπτωσιν ἐς ἠεροειδέα πόντον, said to be the time of stormy winds in the context of seafaring. The same is combined with other astronomical information in Deidamea's warning to Neoptolemus against sailing at the winter solstice 7.300-11, with verbal similarity to the present passage: **367-8 Πληιὰς εὖτ.../δύεθ'** ~ 7.308 ὅτε Πληιάδων πέλεται δύσις, **367 ἐς 'Ωκεανοῖο ῥέεθρα** ~ 7.303 'Ω. κατὰ πλατὺ χεῦμα.

365 καταιγίσι βεβριθυίῃ The metaphorical use of β. is most nearly comparable with the application of ἐπιβρίθω to wind and rain by H. and Q. **366 ναύτῃσι τέρας** is taken from a H. star simile, Δ76; for the addition of a definitive gen. cf. Λ4 πολέμοιο τέρας and Triphiodorus 289 ἀμειλίκτοιο φόβου τ.

367 Πληιὰς is Q.'s only use of the sing. (pl. 4x), which is post-H. (first in Euripides, *Ion* 1152; see K.H. Lee *ad loc.*, ed. 1997, and D. Kidd on Aratus 254-67, ed. 1997).

367 'Ω. ῥέεθρα/ = Ψ205, 2.663, 3.656.

368 περικλυτὸν 'Ωρίωνα/ ~ λ310 κλυτὸν 'Ω./

369 ἠέρα συγκλονέουσα returns to description of the storm. Though Πληιάς is still the subject, the direct action is that of the storm; cf. the use of κλονέω for the action of winds and storms in H. and Q.
369 μέμηνε...πόντος The figurative use of μαίνομαι with an inanimate subject occurs 2x in H. (Θ111, O606) and 12x in Q., including the almost identical μ. δὲ λαίλαπι π./ 9.272. It is not accidental that three of these uses of μ. by Q. are in similes describing Ajax's madness, also 381 and 388; note also 377 μεμηνότα θυμὸν in a lion simile, again relevant to Ajax.
370 † γε μὲν γυῖα † φέρεσκον is the unmetrical reading of the MSS., though two emend μὲν to μιν. All editors except Vian adopt Rhodomann's μιν γ. φ., which is similar to φέρον δέ μιν ὠκέα γυῖα/ 7.345 (=10.440). But Vian (*Rech.* 244 n.1) justly objects to the metrical anomaly of spondaic diaeresis after the fourth foot after a word that is neither a metrically independent monosyllable nor long by nature. He suggests the bold emendation γέ μιν Αἶσα φέρεσκεν, comparing similar statements at 1.273, 5.332, 12.461 and comparable corruptions involving γυῖα 4.68, 9.219. A convincing solution has not been found.
371-8 This long simile of a wild beast frantic over the loss of its young that have been stolen by hunters has the H. model Σ 318-22, a simile of a lion searching for its stolen young, but without verbal similarity, except **376 εἴ που...ἴδοι** ~ Σ322 εἴ ποθεν ἐξεύροι. Familiarity of theme (cf. e.g. Oppian's description of the self-sacrificing love of a lion for its young, *Hal.* 1.709-18) has led Q. here to omit specification of the beast as a lion. Some motifs in the present simile are repeated from Q.'s own similes: foaming jaws **373** from 4.245, in a simile of fighting bulls (see Vian, *Comp.* 32 n.2); **375 ἀμφὶ γένυσσι βεβρυχώς/** ~ 3.146 ὑπαὶ γενύεσσι β./, in a simile of a wounded lion; **377 μεμηνότα θυμὸν ἔχοντι** ~ 1.541 ὀλέθριον ἦτορ ἔχουσα, in a simile of leopard and hunter. Most striking of all is Q.'s reworking of the theme of a lion pursuing hunters who have stolen its young in a simile of the same length as the present one at 7.464-70: **375 ἄντρων ἐξερύσαντες** ~ 7.467 ἄντρῳ...ἐρύσσασθαι; **372 διέσσυται** ~ 7.469 ἐπέσσυται; precise repetition of 3.146 (~375) at 7.470. Yet another variation follows shortly after the last one, 7.504-9, a simile of jackals and wolves defending their young from hunters: **375 ἀ. ἐξ.** and **374 ἢ κυσὶν ἢ ἀγρότῃς** both echoed in 7.506. These comparisons are a remarkable demonstration of Q.'s self-imitation in similes (see Vian, *Comp.* 31).
371 ἀναιδέι θηρὶ ~ ἀναιδέος...λέοντος 7.464, at the start of the simile modelled on the present one; for ἀ. in Q. see 18n.
372 βαθυσκοπέλοιο...ἄγκεα βήσσης/ ~ Υ490 βαθέ' ἄγκεα, Χ190 διά τ' ἄγκεα καὶ διὰ βήσσας/, 9.162 ἄ. βήσσης/, 1.316 βαθυσκοπέλου διὰ βήσσης. Most remarkable is Q.'s use of the rare adj.

βαθ. (also 3.104), which he may have coined; compounds in -σκόπελος are few and mostly in late poetry.
373 /ἀφριόων γενύεσσι = 6.221.
374 ἀγρότῃς is Vian's emendation of the MSS.' -αις. His study of the dat. plurals -ῃς and -αις in the MSS. of Q. (*Rech.* 173-4) shows that -αις prevails at the line end (22x, -ῃς 12x), where its rare H. appearances mostly occur, but is exceptional elsewhere (15x, -ῃς 52x). However, the case for emendation here is less than compelling.
374 contains two examples of Attic correption, **ἀγρότῃς**, as at 22 and 247, and **τέκνα**, which is anomalous, because in Q,'s 25 other uses of τ. the first syllable is long (cf. e.g. 376), as it is always in H. Q. here follows the prevailing practice of Attic drama in scanning τεκν- short; see LSJ s.v., and for the frequency of Attic correption generally in Q. see G. Hermann, *Orphica* 761, and Koechly, *prol.* XXXVI.
375-6 ὃ δ'...τέκνα,— indicates anacoluthon with lack of a main verb, which Koechly (after Scaliger) explains with a lacuna after 375. Anacoluthon is avoided by Pauw's bold but attractive emendation (adopted by Tychsen, Lehrs and Pompella) ἀμφιθέῃσι for **ἀμφὶ γένυσσι 375**, echoing ἀμφιθέεσκεν 371. The sequence of thought in βεβρυχώς, / εἰ...ἴδοι is, however, logically acceptable (*pace* Koechly and Keydell, review of Vian II, *Gnomon* 40 [1968] 572): the roaring is to attract the cubs' attention, affection being indicated by **θυμήρεα 376**. This weakens the case for corruption or a lacuna; see Vian, *Comp.* 239.
378 αὐτοῦ is adv., stressing immediacy of action.
378 βιότοιο...ἦμαρ ~ 2.563 Μέμνονος ἦμαρ...λυγρόν, 5.535 σεῖο...πολύστονον ἦμαρ. These are variations on the H. periphrasis with ἦμαρ for 'day of death', e.g. αἴσιμον and ὀλέθριον ἦ., which Q. uses as well as others. The thematic reprise of 373-4 ἄλγεα...ἀγρότῃς provides a natural closure for the simile.
379 provides a minimal bridge between the similes with brief concluding and introductory statements.
379 ἀμείλιχα θῦνε ~ 14.509-10.
379 Μέλαν...ἦτορ is taken by Vian and Battegay as a metaphorical use of μέλας, an indication of madness. It clearly reflects A103-4 (= δ 661-2) μένεος δὲ μέγα φρένες ἀμφὶ μέλαιναι / πίμπλαντ'..., where φρ. are "thought of as darkened by deep emotion" (Cunliffe, *LHD* μέλας) or "suffused with blood" (Kirk, *Iliad Comm.* I *ad loc.*); cf. μ. with φρ. P83, 499, 573, 10.306 φρένας...κελαινάς.
379 ἔζεεν ἦτορ/ ~ 385 ἔ. θυμός/; for the metaphorical use of ἔζ. see 324n.
380-4 The simile of a boiling cauldron is introduced and followed by metaphorical uses of ἔζεε(ν) 379 and 385, whilst the corresponding verb in the simile is metaphorical **μαίνηται 381**, a clever reversal of normal usage. The unusual theme is taken from Φ 362-4, a simile of melting pig's

fat in a boiling cauldron, with verbal echoes: **380 /εὖτε λέβης** ~ Φ362 /ὡς δὲ λέβης, **381 ὕπαὶ πυρὸς αἰθομένοιο/** ~ Φ362 πυρὶ πολλῷ/, **382 ξύλα πολλὰ θέρηται/** ~ Φ364 ξ. κάγκανα κεῖται/, **383 ἐπειγομένου** ~ Φ362 ἐ-ος, **384 εὐτρεφέος σιάλοιο** ~ Φ363 ἁπαλοτρεφέος σ. The comparison in H. is with the boiling water of a river, quite different from Q.'s bold development of a metaphor.

380 εὖτε as an adv. of comparison = ἠύτε is rare and doubtful in H. , but frequent in Q. (see LSJ s.v. III), 6x with the subjunctive as here.

380 ἐπ' ἐσχάρῃ 'Ηφαίστοιο/ ~ I468 (=Ψ33) διὰ φλογὸς 'H./ in the similar context of fire used to singe off pig's bristles.

381 ῥοιβδηδὸν occurs only here and was probably coined by Q. as a synonym of ῥοιζηδόν, 'with a whistling sound', in keeping with his use of ῥοῖβδος and ἐπιρροιβδέω as = H. ῥοῖζος, -έω.

382 The late position of **ὅτε** is followed in **384** by the even more strikingly postponed **ὥς κεν** in a final clause, which amounts to mannerism.

382 ἀμφὶς ἅπασαν is Koechly's emendation, adopted by Zimmermann and Vian, of the MSS.' syntactically impossible ἀμφὶ δὲ πᾶσαν, which is accepted by Pompella without comment. The earlier emendation by Rhodomann, ἀμφί γε π., is weak, whereas ἀμφίς plus acc. is H. and used by Q. 93 (see n.), 14.130; also the corruption is plausible.

383 /ἐννεσίῃς δρηστῆρος: Way "at the bidding of the toiler", Combellack "serving the plans of a workman"; only the latter suits the context. The two meanings 'advice' and 'will' are recognised by Vian and Battegay for Q.'s frequent use of (ὑπ') ἐννεσίῃς -ῃσι (24x), which reflects H. Fränkel's discussion of the word in A.R. (*Noten* 283-4). The expression is H. (E894), but first used frequently by A.R. (11x); see Campbell on 12.4, who notes the "remarkable variety of nuances in late poetry." The man's eagerness anticipates the agitation of Ajax—cf. θυμῷ/ and 385 θυμός/.

384 εὐτρεφέος is Zimmermann's emendation, adopted by Vian, of the MSS.' εὐτραφέος, which is retained by Pompella. εὐτρεφής is H., -τραφής appears first in Aeschylus. Neither form is used elsewhere by Q., but cf. ἀλιτρεφέος 3.272, διοτρεφέος 6.293; he has no other form with -τραφής, which in general is much less common.

384 σιάλοιο...ἀμέρσῃ περὶ is adv., = 'all over'; ἀ., = 'remove', is constructed with acc. of thing and gen. of person, which is a reversal of the usual construction with acc. of person, which Q. uses 6.243, 11.39. Similar is ἀμέρδω with acc. of thing and dat. of person 12.413. Cf. Q.'s use of ἀπαμέρδω both with acc. of person and gen. of thing and with double acc.

385 πελώριος...θυμός The unusual application of π. may be regarded as a transferred epithet in view of its application to Ajax in H. and Q. (4.464, 5.576).

386-9 The first two comparisons, with sea and storm 386, are a reprise of the first simile in this series 364-9, but are not developed and prepare in their brevity for the third comparison, with a forest fire 387-9. This simile's emphasis on destruction is an effective culmination for the series. The subject is recurrent in Q.'s similes and the present version is similar to two shorter ones in book 1: 1.209-10 πυρὸς ῥιπῇ ἐναλίγκιον, ἥ τ' ἐπὶ θάμνοις / μαίνεται ἀζαλέοισιν ἐπειγομένου ἀνέμοιο, and 1.536-7 ὡς εἰ πυρὶ δάσκιος ὕλη, / οὔρεος ἐν ξυλόχοισιν ἐπισπέρχοντος ἀήτεω; see Vian on 1.209-10 for all such similes in Q. and their models in H. and A.R. Esp. relevant to the present example are three H. similes: Ο 605-6, describing the madness of Hector, esp. /μαίνετο δ' ~ 386 and 388; Λ 155-7, esp. θάμνοι...πίπτουσιν; Β 455-6, esp. ἄσπετον ὕλην/ (cf. also Hesiod, *Th.* 694.)

386 /Μαίνετο is echoed by /μαίνηται 388, metaphorical in the simile, and by Αἴας.../μαίνετο 390-1. For the use of μ. in this passage see 369n.; its repetition at this point effectively marks a climax.

386 ἠὲ is Spitzner's emendation of the MSS.' ἠδὲ = 'and'. The latter may seem appropriate, linking sea and storm as in the simile 364-9, but ἠύτε plus ἠ...ἠ... with three comparisons is used by Q. 8.361-4; cf. also 10.66-71 ὡς ἠ...ἠ...ἠ..., where the alternatives are wind, fire and stormy sea.

387 πυρὸς...μένος ~ ἀκάματον πῦρ 9x in H., 11.94, cf. 14.455 ἀκαμάτου π. ὁρμήν; ~ πυρὸς μένος 3x in H., 5x in Q., cf. esp. λ220 π. κρατερὸν μ. αἰθομένοιο.

388 κατ' ὄρεσφι In the H. use of κ. ὄ. (Δ452, Λ493) -φι = ablatival gen. with a verb of motion, but in Q. κ. ὄ. (also 2.471, 8.364), like κατ' οὔρεος (6.343, 8.230), denotes position without motion, which reflects Q.'s general use of κατὰ plus gen. (see 27-8n.).

388 βίη μεγάλου ἀνέμοιο/ is the reading of the MSS. and all editions except the Aldine, which has βίῃ μ. ἀ. M.L. West (*Philol.* 130 [1986] 145-6) argues for βίῃ on the ground that "we expect the noun of the simile to be the subject of the relative or temporal clause attached to it, and nouns describing attendant circumstances to be subordinate." Also βίῃ μ. ἀ./ occurs 3.508 in a simile. Corruption either way would be easy, and it is impossible to be certain.

389 αἰθομένη πυρὶ πάντοθεν Vian records West's proposed emendation περὶ: cf. περὶ πάντοθεν A.R. 4.1710, περὶ...π. 2x in H., 13.494. Corruption to πυρὶ would be assisted by the context, esp. 381 πυρὸς αἰθομένοιο, but it is no more than a possibility.

389 ἄσπετος ὕλη/ ~ the H. formula (3x) ἄσπετον ὕλην/, which Q. uses at 618.

390-4 In the concluding statement of madness **390 ὀδύνῃσι...ἦτορ** recalls the description of Ajax's condition 325-6 περὶ κραδίην...ἄχος. But the following statement of three physical symptoms, foaming mouth,

gnashing teeth and clashing armour, plus the reaction of the observers, contains no repetition of content from the earlier description 322-32. In the three statements of similar length 391-3 word order is parallel in numbers two and three but contrasted in one.

390 ὀδύνῃσι...ἦτορ ~ E399 κῆρ ἀχέων ὀ. π. (ὀ. π. in the same *sedes*), 12.403 πεπαρμέναι ἀμφ' ὀ. This is adequate support, if any is needed, for Canter's palmary emendation, adopted by all editors, ὀδύνῃσι for the MSS.' amusing corruption 'Οδυσ(σ)ῆι.

391 /μαίνετο in the resumption of the narrative echoes the same verb in 386 and 388.

391-2 Ἄπλετος...ἐκ στόματος ~ 4.245 πουλὺς δ' ἐκ στομάτων χαμάδις καταχεύεται ἀφρός in a simile of bulls describing the wrestling match between Ajax and Diomedes. The motif recalls 373 ἀφριόων γενύεσσι at the start of the preceding similes.

392 βρυχὴ...ὀρώρει ~ 375 ἀμφὶ γένυσσι βεβρυχώς, which favours βρυχή = 'roar'; thus Vian and Battegay, whereas Combellack's "gnashed his teeth" agrees with LSJ, where β. is connected with βρύχω(-κω), not with βρυχάομαι.

393 τεύχεα...ἐπέβραχε reminds us that Ajax is now armed, as though for combat; cf. 354-5. ἐπ. is Wernicke's generally accepted emendation of ὑπ. Both forms are used elsewhere by Q., but here the context favours ἐπ., esp. because corruption would be easy from ὑπο- 394; the same emendation is made 2.495 with MS. support.

393-4 ὁρόωντες/...ὑποτρομέεσκον ~ Y28 ὑ. ὁρόωντες/, of the Trojans' reaction to Achilles.

The final indication of Ajax's formidable strength is underlined by the pointed opposition of **πάντες**, stressed by enjambment, and **ἑνὸς 394**.

395-403: Dawn

The essential statements of Dawn rising from Ocean 395 and general awakening 403 are separated by a mythological digression. 396-8 Personified Sleep leaving the earth meets Hera returning to Olympus from a visit to Tethys. 399-401 Hera greets him with affection because he has been virtually her son-in-law since he helped her by putting Zeus to sleep on Mount Ida. 402-3 She departs for Zeus' house and he for the bed of Pasithea. This is closely based on the H. Deception of Zeus Ξ 200-7, 231-351, with the verbal echo **/Ἥρῃ δὲ ξύμβλητο 397** ~ /Ἔνθ' Ὕπνῳ ξ. Ξ231. But for the narrative function of the passage the H. model is Λ1-2, the rising of Dawn from the bed of Tithonus, the difference here being the remarkable length of the digression. That is to be explained by the equivalence of the present passage, in function and in length, to Q.'s digression on Prometheus 338-45, followed as that is by sunset 346-7. Q. may well be original in this carefully balanced embellishment of what are essentially traditional epic statements of sunset and dawn. Vian (II 16) compares A.R.'s evocation of dusk and dawn before and after the night of

Medea's mental torment (3.744-824), but there the former is a substantial description (*ibid.* 744-50), whilst the latter is only a brief statement (*ibid.* 823-4, cf. Q. 403) and no mythological material is used. Kakridis (62) sees unusual literary merit in Q.'s provision of a pleasing digression as a foil at the present grim point in the narrative. It must be said, however, that relevance of subject matter to the context is even more vague and indirect than is the case with the Prometheus digression. Particularly appealing here is the paradox of Sleep being busy when others sleep and vice versa (cf. 403 and 349).

395 χρυσήνιος 'Ηώς is possibly a novel combination, consciously replacing H. χρυσόθρονος 'Ηώς, which Q. uses 14.1, following ἀπ' 'Ωκεανοῖο... as here.

396 εἴκελος αὔρῃ/ = 3.781; ~ α....ἐναλίγκιος *H.h.Herm.* 147 *et sim.* 3x in Q. Here the image derives charm from the natural association between the breezes and dawn, e.g. ε469 αὔρη...πνέει ἠῶθι πρό.

For the ambiguity of **Τηθύος 398** as name or common noun see 14n.; it has special point in the present context.

399 δέ ἑ κύσσεν is Rhodomann's palmary emendation of the MSS.' δὲ ἔκυσ(σ)εν, which contains illicit hiatus.

399 ἐπεὶ ἦ is Koechly's emendation, adopted by Zimmermann and Vian, of the MSS.' ἐπεί οἱ, which involves seemingly abnormal correption. Corruption would have been easy, esp. from οἱ 400, ἐπεὶ ἦ is a combination favoured by Q., and at 13.429 in the same *sedes* these alternatives are variant readings. However, as Keydell (review of Vian II, *Gnomon* 40 [1968] 572) has pointed out, the meaning of the causal clause is incomplete without οἱ—"because he was a son-in-law to her". οἱ here is resumed and appropriately emphasised by οἱ in 400. Also, the correption may be regarded as consistent with Q.'s metrical practice, since he sometimes allows a final consonant not to make position before οἱ (see Vian, *Rech.* 154-5). Accordingly Pompella is justified in retaining ἐπεί οἱ.

Knowledge of the H. story that is referred to here indicates that **γαμβρὸς 399** must be taken as 'like a son-in-law'.

The addition of **ἀμύμων 399** is best taken as a purely conventional laudatory flourish in view of Q.'s frequent use of it (38x, mostly with names), not with Combellack "She could find no fault".

401 χολούμενον 'Αργείοισιν of Zeus when he was put to sleep is a proleptic reference to the anger that followed his sleep.

The digression ends with a touch of humour in the contrast between **ἔβη 402**, of Hera's journey, and the last word **οἴμησεν 403**, which indicates Sleep's eagerness for his bridal bed. Also, the echoing of **ἐν λεχέεσιν 400** with **ἐπὶ λέκτρα 402** reminds us that now Sleep himself is in the situation which he had previously arranged for Zeus and Hera.

403 ἀνέγρετο...φωτῶν/ = 11.331, after a similar statement about dawn. For the expression ἔθνεα φ. = 'the human race' cf. ἔ. μυρία φ./ pseudo-Oppian, *Cyn.* 1.166.

404-450: Ajax's Madness—the Slaughter of the Sheep

404-5 Ajax goes about possessed by madness. 406-10 He attacks sheep like a hungry lion, and causes them to fall like leaves in a North wind at the approach of winter. 411-2 In attacking the sheep Ajax believes he is killing Greeks. 413-4 Meanwhile Menelaus speaks privately to Agamemnon. 415-8 "Today Ajax's madness will bring disaster, for he will burn the ships and kill us all in anger. 419-21 Would that Thetis had not set up the contest and that Odysseus had not challenged his superior! 422-4 We have made a terrible mistake, because Ajax was our only defence after the death of Achilles. 424-6 The gods will remove him also and bring about our destruction." 427 Agamemnon replies. 428-29a "Odysseus is not to blame, but the malevolent gods. 430-1 He is often a great help against the enemy." 432-4 As they speak, the shepherds are hiding from destruction beside the river Xanthus. 435-8 As hares take cover from the repeated attacks of an eagle, so the shepherds scatter in flight from Ajax. 439-40 Finally Ajax makes a mocking speech over a slaughtered ram. 441-3 "You will be food for dogs and birds; Achilles' armour, for which you challenged your superior, did not save you. 444-8 Neither will your wife and child weep over you, nor will your parents, whom you will not support, since far from home birds and dogs will devour you." 449-50 This is said in the belief that Odysseus lies among the dead.

The essential narrative, embellished with similes and a conventional speech of triumph, occupies little more than half the passage, being interrupted, somewhat abruptly, by the dialogue between Menelaus and Agamemnon 413-32. The latter, which may well be an original touch by Q., is condemned by Vian (II 16) for being weakly connected with the narrative, but that is hardly just. The abruptness of the two changes of scene (413-4, 432-3) does not involve any obscurity and may be seen in the positive light of achieving an effect that one associates more with the stage than with epic narrative. Then Menelaus' speech begins with false predictions that are designed to maximise both dramatic tension and dramatic irony. This compensates considerably for the degree of watering down and glossing over that characterises Q.'s handling of some of the more brutal elements of the traditional story, as will be noted below.

404-12 This description of Ajax killing the sheep is dominated by comparisons of increasing length and syntactical complexity—Orion 404, a hungry lion 406-7 and, with change of focus, falling leaves 409-10. Only after the third is there a formal retrospective link with the narrative, **ὣς 411**.

404 The initial comparison of Ajax with Orion may have been prompted by the latter's mention at 368 in a simile applied to Ajax. But its point here is that Orion was a giant and also met a violent death, and the same are both

true of Typhon, with whom Ajax is compared at 485. An additional point of relevance here to Ajax's attack on the sheep is that Orion was a hunter.

405 ὀλοόφρονα Λύσσαν ~ 12.556 λύσσ' ὀλοή; the difference of epithet here may amount to personification (thus Vian and Battegay λύσσα 2; see 359-60n.).

For the lion simile **406-7** the H. simile that is closest in both content and expression is K 485-6 Ὡς δὲ λέων μήλοισιν ἀσημάντοισιν ἐπελθών, / αἴγεσιν ἢ ὀίεσσι, κακὰ φρονέων ἐνορούσῃ, of which the last word is used by Q. at **411**. Q.'s first use of the theme is 1.277-8 λέων ὣς πώεσι μήλων / ἔνθορε. There are further verbal correspondences with Q.'s own similes: **406 λέων ὣς ὀβριμόθυμος/** = 2.248; **407 λιμῷ...ἦτορ** ~ 8.177 (θῆρες) λευγαλέῳ λ. βεβολημένοι ἦ., 13.44 (λύκος) ἀργ. λ. β-ος ἦ.

The emendation **ἀργαλέῃ 407** for the MSS.' -ῳ (without iota) is justified on the ground that λιμός is fem. 5x elsewhere in Q. and never otherwise certainly masc.

In **408-9 Καὶ τὰ...κάββαλεν** ἐπασσύτερ' indicates influence from the H. formula (3x) πάντας ἐπασσυτέρους πέλασε χθονὶ πουλυβοτείρῃ. The sheep here are in the narrative, those in the simile being naturally understood.

409-10 The simile of leaves made to fall by the North wind at the beginning of winter can be seen as the culmination of several treatments of the subject, one by A.R. and three earlier ones by Q. himself, this being the latest in his work. A.R. 4.216-7 ἢ ὅσα φύλλα χαμᾶζε περικλαδέος πέσεν ὕλης / φυλλοχόῳ ἐνὶ μηνὶ and Q. 1.345-6 τοὶ δὲ θοοῖς φύλλοισιν ἐοικότες ἢ ψεκάδεσσι / πῖπτον ἐπασσύτεροι have just noun and verb in common. The present example is linked to the former by the indication of season and to the latter by the use of ἐπασσύτερ'/-οι, for the meaning of which see D. Kidd on Aratus, *Phaen.* 982 (ed. 1997). Q.'s two other examples are important precedents mainly for the terms in which the season is stated: 2.536-7 ἄτ' ἄσπετα φύλλα κατ' ἄλσος / χείματος ἀρχομένου μετὰ τηλεθόωσαν ὀπώρην; 3.325-7 Εὖτ' ἄνεμοι θοὰ φύλλα κατὰ χθονὸς ἀμφιχέωνται...ἀρχομένου λυκάβαντος, ὅτε φθινύθουσιν ὀπῶραι. **410 ἀνυμένου...** reads like a conscious modification of both models, as does **μένος...Βορέαο 409** of ἄνεμοι 3.325.

The use of **ἠύτε 409** plus subjunctive has only one H. precedent (P547), but is a relatively frequent usage in Q., who strongly favours the subjunctive in similes; cf. esp. 3.325 and see Koechly, *prol.* LXXXIII.

410 ἀνυμένου Heyne's widely accepted emendation ἀνο- is not justified by Q.'s usage; for the form see 58a n.

410 ὅτ'...μετὰ χεῖμα τράπηται, "when winter returns", is Heyne's emendation, adopted by all editors except Pompella, who retains the MSS.' μέγα and translates "quando...grande tempesta scoppia". But that

gives the verb an impossible meaning and loses the progress of the seasons. μετὰ...τράπηται = 'return', however, though not precisely paralleled, is an easy extension from the meaning 'turn around', e.g. Α199. Q.'s two other uses of the verb (11.274, 12.98) = 'change', but μετάτροπον 7.271 = 'returning', a regular meaning of the word that supports the present usage. For **μέγ' ἀσχαλόων 411** see 103n.

412 κακὰς...ἰάλλειν/, or -ε(ν)/, is a possibly original formula of Q.'s (5x), always preceded by a dat. noun; cf. the curiously similar -οις ἐπὶ χεῖρας ἴαλλεν ι288.

413-4 The privacy of the conversation concerning the fate of the whole army is emphasised.

413 ἄγχι παραστὰς/ is a H. formula (7x) used only here by Q.

414 (τοῖον) ποτὶ μῦθον ἔειπε/ is a formula in Q. (12x), replacing H. πρὸς μ. ἔ. (29x in H.), which illustrates Q.'s preference for distinctively epic forms.

415-26 Menelaus begins with prediction of general destruction of Greeks (note **πᾶσιν 415** picked up by **ἡμ<έ>ας/πάντας 417-8**), which is to prove false (see 404-450n.). Content and expression here are similar to 355ff., Ajax's deliberation. Then the main burden of his speech is expression of regret for the immediate past (419-24), followed by a concluding prediction (424-6) that will prove true in an unexpected way.

415 πᾶσιν...ἦμαρ ~ Δ164 (=Ζ448) ἔσσεται ἦμαρ, ὅτ' ἄν ποτ' ὀλώλῃ Ἴλιος ἱρή; Τ294 πάντες ὀλ. ἦ. ἔπεσπον. The combination ὀλ. (...) ἦ. occurs 3x in Q.

416 περὶ φρεσὶ μαινομένοιο ~ (ἐνὶ) φρ. μ. 2x in H.; ἐν φρ. μ. 2x in Q.; ἀνὰ φρένας μ. 2x in Q.

417-8 τάχα...κλισίῃσι is a close repetition of 356-7, where there is a similar runover of πάντας.../Ἀργείους.

Spitzner's emendation **ἡμ<έ>ας/ 417** replaces the MSS.' Attic ἡμᾶς, unique in Q. But because ἡμέας is otherwise only dactylic in Q., it is better to credit him with an isolated Atticism here, as does Pompella.

For **Ὡς ὄφελον** plus indic. **419-21** see 206n.; here there may be conscious reflection of Odysseus' words at λ548.

419 τῶνδε...περὶ δῆριν ἔθηκε is Zimmermann's and Vian's modification of the emendation πέρι, first implied in Rhodomann's translation. πέρι is preferable, taken with the preceding gen., but the only real objection to the MSS.' πρὶν is the metrical one of bucolic diaeresis after a monosyllable that is not long by nature (see Vian, *Rech.* 244). Since that is hardly compelling, Pompella is justified in retaining πρὶν. West (*Phil.* 130 [1986] 146) proposes τῶν γε in place of τῶνδε on the ground that an anaphoric reference to τευχέων 418 is required, not a deictic one, but the latter is surely possible for something understood to be nearby. Also τῶν γε would give inappropriate emphasis.

Both at **420-1** and at **423-4** Menelaus expresses Q.'s consistent prejudice in favour of Ajax.

422 ἀασάμεσθα = 9.509 in Agamemnon's speech of apology to Philoctetes (9.491-515), where there is attribution of blame to the gods or fate similar to the present (cf. below 429a, and 582 said by Odysseus; see Vian, II 15 n.2). The whole of **422** is close to Agamemnon's words at T137 ἀασάμην καί μευ φρένας ἐξέλετο Ζεύς; cf. also Ag.'s use of ἀ. I116, 119. This H. background supports Bonitz's emendation **ἤπαφε 422** rather than the MSS'. ἤκαχε; for the corruption see 181n.

423-4 The claim made for Ajax, including the metaphor ἕρκος, reflects the words of Odysseus to Ajax's shade, λ556 Τοῖος γάρ σφιν πύργος ἀπώλεο. ἕρκος itself is used 3x of Ajax and 1x of Achilles in H.; otherwise in Q. 3x of Achilles. For **δεδουπότος 423** = τεθνηκότος see 219n.

424 Αἴαντος ἐΰ σθένος = 322; for the periphrasis see 4n.

424-6 ἡμέων, referring to the whole army, is first contrasted with the dual **νῶιν** and then picked up by **πάντες**, the purpose clause echoing 415, an example of ring composition.

Vian's emendation **ἐξελόωσι 425**, adopted by Pompella, for the MSS.' ἐξολόωσι is an improvement on the earlier editors' ἐξολέ(σ)ουσι. Lloyd-Jones (*CR* 17 [1967] 275) unconvincingly queries Vian's claim that ἐξολ. would require a dat. in place of the separative gen. ἡμέων; he does not answer Vian's second point that the context requires 'will remove' (sc. Ajax somehow), not 'will destroy', since Menelaus cannot foresee Ajax's suicide. For the corruption cf. 9.83, where Struve emends ὀλέσσῃ to ἐλάσσῃ.

West's **ἄιστοι 426** is a necessary correction of the MSS.' -ον (with ὄλεθρον), since ἀ. is always applied to persons = 'unseen', 'destroyed', and the corruption is easy. Pompella's translation of ἄιστον...ὄλεθρον, 'ignobile morte', is not legitimate.

The combination of **ἀναπλήσωμεν 426** *et sim.* and **ὄλεθρον** occurs 3x in Q.; cf. ἀν. plus πότμον in H. and Q.

427 = 165, an unusual full-line repetition. For **ἐυμμελίης Ἀγαμέμνων** see 165n.

428-31 Agamemnon limits his reply to defence of Odysseus, not challenging the assumption of Ajax's superiority.

There is perhaps conscious alliteration in "**Μή...μέγ' 428**. **μέγ'...θυμῷ/** = 2.35, 3.285 (-οις); ~ Z524 ἄχνυται ἐν θυμῷ.

For **μητιόωντι 429** see 135n.

429 Κεφαλλήνων βασιλῆι is possibly a novel combination; cf. esp. B631 αὐτὰρ Ὀδυσσεὺς ἦγε Κεφαλλῆνας μεγαθύμους.

429a was so numbered by Zimmermann because it is absent from most MSS. and therefore from earlier editions, the loss being due to haplography of **μητιόωντι 429** and **-ται 429a**.

429a-30 ἀλλὰ...ἐστιν The terms in which the gods are blamed and Odysseus exonerated resemble the words of Od. to Ajax λ555, 558-60. Note the difference between **νῶιν 429a**, 'for us two', and **ἡμῖν 430** referring to the army; cf. the same usage at 425.

The contrasted statements **μάλα...δυσμενέεσσιν 430-1** are emphasised by chiasmus; cf. ζ184-5 πόλλ' ἄλγεα δυσμενέεσσιν,/ χάρματα δ' εὐμενέτῃσι.

432 ἠγορόωντο/ = Δ1, A.R. 3.168. Vian and Battegay s.v. point out that the verb does not have its proper sense of 'speak in assembly', since it refers to a secret dialogue (cf. 414), but this has adequate precedent (see LSJ s.v. II 2).

433-8 The description of the shepherds' escape from Ajax (cf. 411) is probably an innovation on Q.'s part, because it contradicts the tradition followed by Sophocles (*Ajax* 27) and Apollodorus (*Epit.* V 6), and it serves Q.'s purpose of presenting Ajax in the best light (thus Vian, II 15). **433 Μηλονόμοι** Q. uses this rare word 5x, the H. -βοτήρ 2x.

433-4 παρὰ...μυρίκῃσιν Cf. Φ 15-18 and 350-2 for the presence of tamarisk bushes beside the Xanthus.

There is no justification for Koechly's **ὑπὸ 434** in place of the MSS.' ὑπαὶ, retained by Pompella, since the latter, though not metrically necessary here, occurs at least 18x in Q.

435-7 The simile of hares trying to hide from an eagle is developed from two H. similes of an eagle catching a hare, P 674-8 (focused on the hare like the present simile), X 308-10: **436 /θάμνοις ἐν λασίοισιν** ~ P677 /θάμνῳ ὑπ' ἀμφικόμῳ; **436 ἐγγύθεν** is in contrast to P676 καὶ ὑψόθ' ἐόντα, as is the implied escape of the hares to P678 ἐξείλετο θυμόν; **435 ὑποπτώσσωσι λαγωοί/** ~ X310 πτῶκα λαγωόν/. But the description of the eagle in Q.'s simile is adapted from two H. similes less closely related in theme: **436 ἐγγύθεν ὀξὺ κεκληγὼς/** ~ X141 ἐ. ὀ. λεληκὼς/ (sc. κίρκος); **437 πωτᾶτ'...πτερύγεσσιν** ~ B462 ἔνθα καὶ ἔνθα ποτῶνται ἀγαλλόμενα πτ. (various birds). Lastly, the similarity of the present simile to Orphic *Lithica* 147-8, ὥς τις τε Διὸς γαμψώνυχα φεύγων / αἰετὸν ἐν πυκινοῖσι λάθῃ θάμνοισι λαγωός, has been seen by Keydell (*Bursian* 230 [1931] 79) as one of several indications of Q.'s influence on that work. The correspondence of the bushes in the simile (436) with the tamarisks in the narrative (434), reinforced by related verbs, is an unusually close parallel for a developed simile in Q.

ὅτ' 436 is defended by Vian against Spitzner's ὃ δ' on the ground that Q. does not avoid a succession of temporal clauses in similes.

438 ὄβριμον ἄνδρα is not H., but formulaic in Q. (7x).

439-50 Ajax's speech of triumph, framed by two introductory and two concluding lines, is delivered over the slaughtered ram which he supposes to be Odysseus. This is Q.'s version, more restrained and more in keeping with

his notion of epic dignity, of the mutilation and flogging of two rams in Ajax's hut, spoken of at three points in Sophocles' version (*Aj.* 101-17, 237-44, 296-304). The speech itself (**441-8**) is one of eight examples in Q. of the epic convention of the formal utterance of mocking insults over a slain or dying enemy, which exemplifies Q.'s liking for variations on a rhetorical theme (see Vian, I xxxix). The other examples are 1.644-53 Achilles over Penthesilea, 1.757-65 Achilles over Thersites, 6.385-9 Eurypylus over Nireus, 6.414-24 and 431-4 Eurypylus over Machaon, 8.211-6 Neoptolemus over Eurypylus, 13.359-73 Menelaus over Deiphobus. With several of these the present speech is linked by verbal correspondences, notably in the opening line (see below). The speeches range in length from four to fifteen lines. This one exhibits considerable rhetorical skill. The initial **"Κεῖσο...κυνῶν...441** with its expressive alliteration is echoed by the second start **Κεῖσο, κύον 444**, where the metaphorical κύον is contrasted with the literal κυνῶν 441. Then the principal, commonplace theme of the victim being unmourned by his family and suffering the ultimate indignity of being devoured by dogs and birds (**444-8**) leads naturally to ring composition, with the last line echoing, with greater elaboration, the second half of the first line. It is hardly adequate to dismiss this with Vian (II 16) as "la plus désespérante banalité".

439 ἀρνειοῖο Mention of the slaughtered ram resumes the main narrative from 411-2.

The memorable expression **ὀλοὸν γελάσας 440** recalls the emphasis on laughter in Sophocles' version of the episode, esp. *Aj.* 79 and 303 (directed at Odysseus); cf. the manic laughter of Heracles, Euripides, *Her.* 935 γέλωτι παραπεπληγμένῳ.

For **τοῖον...ἔειπε 440** see 414n.

441 = 1.644.

441 "Κεῖσό...κονίῃσι = 1.757, 6.385; ~ 6.431; the other occurrences are all in the similar speeches of mockery listed above (439-50n.)

441 "Κεῖσό νυν ~ Φ122 'Ενταυθοῖ νῦν κεῖσο, Achilles over Lycaon.

442 οὐδ', 'not even', is a necessary correction of the MSS.' οὔτ', the combination with οὐ γάρ being paralleled elsewhere in Q. (see Vian and Battegay οὐδέ 2d).

The variants **ἀφραδέως 443** and -ων are both paralleled elsewhere and possibly correct.

The force of **ἀφραδέως...δηριάασκες 443** is the greater for its closeness to Menelaus' statement at 420-1.

443 μέγ' ἀμείνονι ~ X345 (Achilles to Hector), 6.415 (Eurypylus to Machaon); for the reader, not the speaker, it recalls 420 significantly.

444 κύον ~ X345 (Achilles to Hector), 13.359 (Menelaus to Deiphobus).

444-8 The treatment of the theme of dying unmourned and unburied is very close to X 86-89 (Hecuba) οὔ σ' ἔτ' ἔγωγε / κλαύσομαι...οὐδ'

ἄλοχος...κύνες ταχέες κατέδονται. Cf. also e.g. Euripides, *Tro.* 376-82 and see K.H. Lee *ad loc.* (ed. 1976).

444 σὲ γὰρ οὔ τι is a subtle variation on οὐ γάρ σ' οὐδ' 442.

445 κουριδίη Q. uses κ. 6x (and -ος 2x) as a noun, which may be an innovation.

The assonance of **ἀάσχετον ἀσχαλόωσα 445** is expressive.

446-7 τοῖς...πάτρης is reminiscent of Achilles' words about himself Ω 540-2; cf. also Δ 477-8 (= P 301-2) οὐδὲ τοκεῦσιν / θρέπτρα φίλοις ἀπέδωκε, of which Q. has a variation 11.88-89.

Koechly shows that his emendation **ἐλδομένοισι 446**, for the MSS.' ἐλπ., is in keeping with many comparable statements in H. and Q., esp. with the very similar 10.141-2. However, Pompella seems justified in retaining ἐλπ. on the ground that Q. always (18x) has the dat. pl. participle of the other verb with the stem ἐελδ., never with ἐλδ., which is altogether exceptional in Q.

The repetition of **ἐσθλὸν ὄνειαρ 447** after 431 is more likely to be accidental than for intended contrast.

447-8 ἐπεί...δαρδάψουσιν" is reminiscent of Achilles' words to Hector X 335-6, 354.

448 δεδουπότα δαρδάψουσιν" provides expressive alliteration at the end of the speech to match that at the beginning 441, underlining the repeated motif that rings the speech. For δαρδ. cf. Λ479 in a simile and 11.245 in a similar context.

449-50 δολόεντα...ὀιόμενος draws attention to Ajax's deranged state, and κταμένοις is pointedly ambiguous in its reference.

For **δολόεντα...'Οδυσῆα 449** see 358n.

450 μεμορυγμένον..πολλῷ/ = 6.255 (-ος), ~ ν435 -α καπνῷ/.

451-486: Ajax's Recovery and Suicide

451-2 Athena releases Ajax from destructive Madness. 453-5 Madness goes to the Styx, from where the Avenging Spirits (Erinyes) send suffering to proud mortals. 456-8 Astonished to see sheep, Ajax suspects divine deception. 458-62 In his anguish he is unable to move and stands rooted like a high mountain peak. 463-4 Recovering his mind, he groans and laments. 465-7 "Why did the gods hate me so much as to make me mad and kill innocent sheep? 468-70 I wish I had taken revenge on the evil Odysseus who caused my ruin. 470-2 May he suffer the deserved anguish inflicted by the Erinyes. 472-5 May they inflict disastrous warfare on the Greeks, and may Agamemnon not reach home unscathed. 476-8 Why should a good man like me stay with an army and a life that are hateful? 478-9 The inferior man is preferred to the good one. 479-81 The Greeks honour Odysseus and forget all my services." 482-4 With that Ajax drives Hector's sword through his throat and blood gushes out. 484-6 He is stretched out like Typhon by Zeus' thunderbolts, and the ground groans with his fall.

Almost half of this episode is occupied by Ajax's soliloquy, 465-81, which is the counterpart of his last soliloquy in Sophocles' version, *Aj.* 815-65. That is considerably longer and mostly quite different from this one, with the important exception of the prayer to the Erinyes, *Aj.* 835-44, which is similar to Ajax's curse at 470-5 (see *ad loc.* for details). That is the only case of close and obvious imitation of Sophocles by Q. in this episode. Other links listed by Vian are not close and indicate no more than general acquaintance with Sophocles' version.

451-5 The second intervention of Athena, which appears not to be attested in the earlier tradition (thus Kakridis 63), is treated at about the same length as the first at 360-4, and is marked by the use of the same name, **Τριτωνίς**. But for Λύσσαν 360 is now substituted the synonym **Μανίην 452**, and its personification leads into a surprising mythological digression on the function of the **'Ερινύες 454** (for the spelling see 31-3n.) in Hades. This seemingly unjustified digression shortly afterwards proves to be a significant foreshadowing of Ajax's curse at 470-5, with its appeal to the same traditional function of the Erinyes. The passage can also be seen as a mythological counterpart at the end of Ajax's madness to the scientific excursus at its beginning, 322-8.

451-2 ἀπὸ φρενὸς...Μανίην ~ Υ341 ἀπ' ὀφθαλμῶν σκέδασ' ἀχλύν, of Poseidon and Achilles.

452 Personified **Μανίην** in the sing. is unusual (see Kakridis 170), but actual identification of the pl. Maniae with Erinyes is attested by Pausanias (8.34.1).

452 Μανίην βλοσυρὴν Spitzner's -ρὴν, for the MSS.' -ρὸν with following ὄλεθρον, has been adopted by all editors except Pompella. It is favoured by the fact that Q. mostly applies βλ. to visible features of living creatures; cf. esp. 10.195 and 14.454 of Medusa. Also relevant is 8.243 βλοσυρῶπις 'Ερινύς in view of the present association of Μανίη with the Erinyes. In favour of the MSS.' reading, however, is 11.10 ὀλοὸν πνείουσαι ὄλεθρον/, of Eris and Enyo compared with the Erinyes. Accordingly the case for emendation is not compelling.

453-5 Location of the Erinyes in Hades is H. (I 454-7, 568-72, T 259-60), and their sending of ἀνῖαι, echoed by that of ἄλγεα 470-2 below, is similar to that of ἄτη T 87-88, ο 233-4.

453 Στυγὸς αἰνὰ ῥέεθρα Vian (*Rech.* 195) has justified rejection of Spitzner's widely accepted emendation αἰπὰ, even though it is supported by Θ369 and 6.266, because this is one of several combinations in which Q. uses either αἰπύς or αἰνός according to the context, and here the pathetic force of αἰνὰ is appropriate.

454 θοαὶ...'Ερινύες may have been prompted by θοῶς 453, but the adj. is appropriate, like ταχεῖαι...'Ερ. Sophocles, *Aj.* 843.

456 κατὰ χθονὸς ἀσπαίροντα/ ~ Γ293 ἐπὶ χ. ἀ-ας/.

457 θάμβεεν ἐν φρεσὶ ~ 2.146 ἐθ. ἐν φ., ἀνὰ θυμὸν ἐθάμβεον 2x in H.
Rhodomann's emendation **δόλον 457** for the MSS.' χόλον is favoured by the context; cf. esp. 422 and 466. 'Anger' from the gods would not be impossible, but would involve some ellipsis of meaning. For δόλον εἶναι after a form of οἴομαι cf. δ453, κ232, and for the corruption see Campbell in support of Vian's emendation δόλον 12.15. Ajax's return to sanity is marked first by his clear observation of his surroundings and then by his attempt to explain what he sees, here indicated by γάρ in 457. This is a recurrent pattern in such scenes: cf. Sophocles, *Aj.* 305-12, Euripides, *Her.* 1089-97, *Ba.* 1277-86; in the tragic exx. the attempt at explanation takes the dramatic form of questions to bystanders.
458 ὑπεκλάσθη μελέεσσι/ = 1.596. The verb (9x in Q.) is not H., but cf. κατεκλάσθη φίλον ἦτορ 7x in H. and κ. in similar expressions 4x in Q.
459 θυμὸν ἀρήιον The combination occurs 5x in Q., but is not H.
459-62 Ajax's inability to move recalls 329 ἔστη ἀκινήτῳ ἐναλίγκιος, which is echoed in 461.
459-60 οὐδ' ἄρα πρόσσω...οὔτ' ἄρ' ὀπίσσω ~ 9.243; cf. π. καὶ ὀ. 4x in H.
The meaning attributed by Vian and Battegay to **ἐπιβήμεναι 460**, 'avancer' (cf. Combellack 'move', Way 'take one step'), seems to be unparalleled. It is therefore surprising that Lehrs is the only editor to adopt Bonitz's attractive emendation ἔτι βήμεναι.
461-2 For the occurrences of the simile theme of a peak or a rock in H., Q. and elsewhere see Vian, II 151 n.1. All the others differ in that their point of comparison is resistance to attack, apart from the obvious H. model for this passage, Ρ 432-6, where the grief-stricken horses of Achilles, refusing to go forward or back, are likened to a gravestone. Possibly unique here is the emphasis on the height of the peak, which is obviously appropriate for Ajax.
Struve's emendation **ὑπερτάτη 462**, for the MSS.' -τέρη, after πασάων, conforms with more correct usage and indeed with Q.'s own prevailing usage (about ten cases of superlative with πάντων or ἄλλων), but Keydell (*Gnomon* 40 [1968] 574) justifiably questions such normalising of Q. in the distinction between comparative and superlative (also 2.415 and 4.267). Partly for the same reason Pompella retains ὑπερτέρη; cf. Campbell on 12.275-6.
462 ἐρρίζωται/ = 8.169 in a related simile.
463 οἱ πάλι...ἀγέρθη/ ~ Δ152 ἄψορρόν οἱ θ. ἐ. στ. ἀ./, similar recovery from a state of shock.
464 ἀνεστονάχησεν ~ Sophocles, *Aj.* 322 ὑπεστέναζε of Ajax. This compound is used 3x in Q., a rare equivalent of ἀναστένω, -στενάχω and -στεναχίζω.

464 ἔπος δ' ὀλοφύρετο τοῖον/ is a formula in Q. (4x, with variation between -ετο and -ατο); cf. the H. ὁ-ος (-η) ἔπεα πτερόεντα προσηύδα. Vian remarks that ὀλ. is the *mot juste* for a personal lament (cf. 508ff.), of which the following monologue is virtually an example.
465-81 Ajax's parting soliloquy of seventeen lines is carefully constructed, with a mixture of questions, wishes and statements, and the following sense units ranging in length from just under two lines to just under four lines: 465-7 realisation of his deception by the gods; 468-70 regret at not taking revenge on Odysseus; 470-2 cursing of Odysseus; 472-3 cursing of the Greek army; 474-5 cursing of Agamemnon; 476-8 decision to quit life; 478-81 (the longest in conclusion) justification of his decision. Elderkin (*Aspects of the Speech*) notes that this is one of just five monologues in Q., the others being 1.100-14 Andromache, 3.57-59 Apollo, 10.424-31 Oenone, 10.471-6 a nymph. Of these only Andromache's approaches the present one in length, whilst it is Oenone's, which contains her decision to end her life with Paris, that is similar in function.
465-7 is better punctuated as one sentence, with a question mark after θυμοῦ, as is done by Pompella. This rhetorical question concerning the enmity of the gods in general is notably different from Ajax's statement ἀλλά μ' ἁ Διὸς...αἰκίζει, Soph., *Aj.* 401-2.
465 "Ὤ μοι = A149; it occurs 7x in Q.
465 ἀπέχθομαι ἀθανάτοισιν ~ κ75 ἀθ. ἀπεχθόμενος.
466 Οἵ...βλάψαντο ~ ξ178 τόν τις ἀθανάτων βλάψε φρένας; cf. 509 below. The use of the middle active of βλ. is possibly unique; LSJ s.v. cites only this reference for it. Comparable is the following **ἐπὶ...ἔθεντο 466** = 'inflicted', which is at least a very unusual use of the middle, but cf. 6.16 ὀδύνας ἐνεθήκατο (ἐπ- West). Cf. also 12.435 ἔθεντο in the same *sedes*, where, as Campbell notes, ἔθηκαν would be expected.
466 κακὴν...ἔθεντο ~ Sophocles, *Aj.* 452 ἐμβαλοῦσα λυσσώδη νόσον. **467 τά...αἴτια** ~ A153.
Rhodomann's emendation **θυμοῦ 467** should be regarded as palmary, in place of the MSS.' θυμῷ, which is likely to have been affected by the same in 470. For the statement with θ. = 'anger' cf. 581-2 Χόλου...αἴτιος. There is no call for such radical emendation as West's πάμπαν, which is rashly supported by Lloyd-Jones (*CR* 17 [1967] 275).
For **Ὡς ὄφελον 468** plus infinitive see 194n.
468 Ὀδυσσέος ἀργαλέον κῆρ/ is a variation on Ὀ....κερδαλέον κῆρ/ 306; see n. *ad loc.*
469 με...ἄτῃ ~ 322-3 αὐτῷ / ἄτη...περικάππεσε; see n. *ad loc* for Q.'s use of this type of double compound verb. The present construction of περικάββ. is different from Q.'s one other use of it 1.819..
469 κακῇ...ἄτῃ may be thought weak after κακὴν...λύσσαν 466, but it is psychologically appropriate.

470-5 Ajax's curse against Odysseus, the Greek army and Agamemnon is in terms of suffering inflicted as punishment by the Erinyes. As noted above (on 451-86), this is a clear reflection of the curse pronounced by Ajax in the speech that immediately precedes his suicide in Sophocles' play (*Aj.* 835-44, see Stanford *ad loc.*, ed. 1963), but the details of the latter are markedly different from the Q.'s version. There the Erinyes are called to witness Ajax's death at the hands (in effect) of both Agamemnon and Menelaus, to bring about their deaths in return, and not to spare the whole army. The most important difference is that Odysseus is not mentioned. For his inclusion in the present curse Q. needed no particular precedent, though he could have been influenced by Sophocles, *Aj.* 387-91, where Ajax appeals to Zeus in considering how he may effect the deaths of Odysseus, Agamemnon and Menelaus before his own.

470-2 Πάθοι...ἀργαλέοις is a studied echo of 454-5 (see 451-5n.): ἄλγεα...μητιόωνται ~ 455 ἐφιᾶσιν ἀνίας, ἀνθρώποισιν / ἀργαλέοις ~ 454-5 βροτοῖσιν /...ὑπερφιάλοισι. More immediately, **ἀργαλέοις 472**, in emphatic enjambment, picks up 468 'Ὀδ. ἀργαλέον κῆρ.

470 γε μὲν is Koechly's universally adopted emendation of the MSS.' δέ κεν; for this combination, with adversative force, in Q. see Vian and Battegay s.v. γε III; it is answered by δοῖεν δὲ (MSS. τε) 472.

470 ἄλγεα θυμῷ/ occurs 6x in H. immediately preceded by πάθον *vel. sim.*

473 ὑσμίνας ὀλοὰς The combination occurs 3x in Q., who avoids the H. ὑ. plus κρατερή *et sim.*

473 πένθεα δακρυόεντα is possibly a unique combination.

474-5 The curse concerning Agamemnon's homecoming effectively foreshadows his well-known fate.

Pompella seems justified in rejecting Koechly's **μηδ' ὅ γ' 474** for the MSS.' μηδ' ὅς, since the latter, with ὅς as a demonstr. pronoun, is a H. combination and at 12.476 οὐδ' ὅς and οὐδ' ὅ γ' are variant readings. Pompella compares 1.769-70, where ὅς μὲν is answered by ὃ δ'.

476 τί μοι...ἐόντα; The interrog. pronoun plus dat. and infin. logically implies ellipsis of κέρδος, ὄφελος or the like; thus Lehrs "quid me iuvat...", Vian "à quoi bon...", and cf. 13.342 καὶ γάρ οἱ θέμις ἐστὶ μετέμμεναι ἀθανάτοισιν. Here the intended effect seems to be informality of speech under intense emotion. The rhetorical question is a more powerful version of the words of Achilles Σ 90-91, οὐδέ με θυμὸς ἄνωγεν / ζώειν οὐδ' ἄνδρεσσι μετέμμεναι, which Q. echoes more closely at 13.283-4, the most important difference here being the pointed contrast between στυγεροῖσι and ἐσθλὸν.

477 /Ἐρρέτω = 6.27, 3x in H.; its repetition within the line as first word of the next sentence expresses emotion like the repetition of /Κεῖσο 441 and 444.

478 /ἄσχετος, in emphatic enjambment, = 'unbearable', a non-H. sense of the word favoured by Q.; cf. e.g. adv. ἀάσχετον 445.
478-81 The perceived injustice of the treatment of Ajax and Odysseus is stated first in general and then in particular terms, with chiasmus of contrasted negative and positive statements followed by positive and negative. In the former pair the initial **ἐσθλὸς 478** picks up ἐσθλὸν 476, **χερείων 478** recalls 443, and the whole is a conscious variation on the words of Achilles Ι 319, ἐν δὲ ἰῇ τιμῇ ἠμὲν κακὸς ἠδὲ καὶ ἐσθλός. Tychsen's **ἐπὶ 480** is a necessary emendation of the MSS.' ἀπό; cf. Κ99 ἐπὶ πάγχυ λάθωνται/. But Spitzner's **<θ'> 481** is not strictly necessary, because ἐμεῦ 480 can either depend on ἔργων or be in apposition to it.
481 ὁππόσ' [sc. ἔργα]...**ἔτλην** involves a slight zeugma, but for τλάω plus ἔργον cf. 646, 10.430.
482-4 The essential statement of Ajax's suicide is positively laconic in its brevity. It is remarkable that while Q. follows the same tradition as Sophocles (*Aj.* 817 ff., 1026 ff.) that the instrument was the sword given to him by Hector, he pointedly departs from the natural and realistic version that it pierced his flank as he fell on it (*Aj.* 833-4) and states that he "thrust it through his neck" (Combellack), which is difficult to envisage. It is difficult to avoid the conclusion (*pace* Vian and Kakridis 63-64) that Q. thereby makes an ill-judged allusion to one version of the traditional invulnerability of Ajax, recorded in the BD scholium to Ψ821, that his neck was the only vulnerable spot. It is the more ill-judged for the fact that Q. otherwise understandably avoids such an element of the tradition that was incompatible with his predominantly realistic narrative. Indeed at 1.566-7 he states the quite different tradition that it was destined simply that Ajax's blood would not be shed by enemy action (see Vian *ad loc.*).
482 πάις...Τελαμῶνος = 580. The formal, dignified phrase, with laudatory epithets applied to both father and son, is here an appropriate indication of the solemnity of the moment of death, whilst in the latter passage it is used by Odysseus in his lament seemingly as a gesture of deference. ἐσθλὸς in the narrative picks up its use by Ajax of himself in 476 and 478.
For **ἐυσθενέος 482** see 256n.
483-4 αἷμα...κελάρυζεν ~ Λ813.
484 Ὁ δ'...τανύσθη/ = 11.69, 203; ~ Σ26, 6.522.
Both the one-line simile of Typhon consumed by Zeus' thunderbolts (485) and the following statement that the earth groaned beneath the fall of Ajax (486) are a close reflection of Β 781-5, where it is twice stated that the earth groaned beneath the feet of the advancing Greek army as when Zeus (with the epithet τερπικεραύνῳ 781) lashed the earth in his anger with Typhoeus, for whose identity with Typhon see LSJ Τυφῶν. Another important model for the present passage is Q.'s own elaborate comparison of the fall of Achilles with the killing of Tityus by Apollo at 3.392-9,

where the earth is personified as the mother of Tityus, so that her groaning at his fall (397) acquires special meaning. A further light in which the present simile can be seen is as a more elaborate counterpart of the comparison of Ajax with Orion at 404 (see n. *ad loc.*).

The active middle **ἐνεπρήσαντο 485** is a very rare usage; for the same phenomenon see 466n.

For **γαῖα μέλαινα 486** see 48n.

486 μέγα στονάχησε ~ 1.573, 12.539. Although this groaning of the earth must be understood literally of the sound of Ajax's fall, it has overtones of the sympathy of nature (cf. 3.397), esp. as a contrived counterpart of Ajax's groan at 464.

486 πεσόντος/ is an appropriate closure, though logically it should precede τανύσθη 484.

487-663: The Mourning and Funeral of Ajax

This whole episode is conceived as a counterpart and close reflection of the mourning and funeral of Achilles, 3.385-787, on a considerably reduced scale, 177 lines as opposed to 403, but with a similar overall pattern and many elements in common. Q.'s purpose is obviously to underline the similar status of the two heroes and the similar implications of their deaths, as is made explicit near the end, 658 τὸν γὰρ τίον ἶσον Ἀχιλλεῖ, which is a simplified version of λ 556-8, words to the same effect spoken by Odysseus to the shade of Ajax. It is therefore helpful to begin by summarising the contents first of 3.385-787 and then of the present episode, leaving the details of the points of similarity to the introductions to individual components and to the line-by-line notes.

The mourning and funeral of Achilles reflect in broad outline the condensed account of the same given by the shade of Agamemnon to that of Achilles ω 43-84; elaboration of some of its components is closely modelled on the corresponding parts of the mourning and funeral of Patroclus in the *Iliad*, as will be noted in the following summary: **(1)** mourning of the Greeks round the body of Achilles, 3.385-421—cf. Σ 233-8, 314-22; **(2)** mourning of the Myrmidons, 3.422-6—cf. Ψ 4-18; **(3)** lament of Ajax, 3.427-59; **(4)** lament of Phoenix, 3.460-90; **(5)** lament of Agamemnon, 3.491-504; **(6)** renewed mourning of the Greeks, 3.504-13; **(7)** advice of Nestor to stop mourning and to attend to the corpse, 3.514-24; **(8)** preparation of the corpse, 3.525-32—cf. Σ 343-53; **(9)** the corpse is preserved by Athena, 3.533-43—cf. Ψ 184-91, ω 18-21; **(10)** lament of Briseis, 3.544-81—cf. T 282-302; **(11)** mourning of the Nereids, Muses and Greeks, 3.582-605—cf. Σ 35-51, 65-69; **(12)** lament of Thetis, 3.606-30— cf. Σ 52-64; **(13)** consolation of Thetis by Calliope, 3.631-54; **(14)** passage of night and mourning of the Greeks and sea gods, 3.655-71; **(15)** preparation of the pyre, 3.672-93—cf. Ψ 110-27, 135-53, 163-76; **(16)** funeral procession, 3.694-6—cf. Ψ 128-34; **(17)** the pyre is burnt through the intervention of Zeus, Boreas and Zephyr, 3.696-718—cf. Ψ 192-218; **(18)** the bones are collected and preserved, 3.719-39—cf. Ψ 236-44, 249-

54; (**19**) construction of the tomb and mound on a headland, 3.740-2—cf. Ψ 245-8, 255-7; (**20**) mourning of Achilles' horses, 3.743-65—cf. P 426-58; (**21**) consolation of Thetis by Poseidon, 3.766-83; (**22**) dispersal of the Greeks, Muses and Nereids, 3.784-7.

The present episode of the mourning and funeral of Ajax consists of the following: (**1**) mourning of the Greeks round the body of Ajax, 487-99; (**2**) lament of Teucer, 500-20; (**3**) lament of Tecmessa, 521-58; (**4**) consolation of Tecmessa by Agamemnon, 559-67; (**5**) renewed mourning of the Greeks, 568-70; (**6**) lament of Odysseus, 571-97; (**7**) advice of Nestor to stop mourning and to attend to the funeral, 598-611; (**8**) preparation of the corpse, 612-7; (**9**) preparation of the pyre, 618, 620-36; (**10**) funeral procession, 619; (**11**) the pyre is burnt through the intervention of Thetis, 637-52; (**12**) the bones are collected and preserved, 653-5; (**13**) construction of the burial mound near Cape Rhoeteum, 655-6; (**14**) dispersal of the Greeks and passage of night, 657-63.

The more modest scale of the present episode compared with that in honour of Achilles is reflected in the smaller number of components, which is accounted for by having fewer laments and associated action, whilst both funerals consist of the same number of traditional elements. The laments of Teucer and Odysseus correspond respectively with those of Phoenix and Ajax for Achilles, though in reverse order, whilst the lament of Tecmessa corresponds with those of both Briseis and Thetis for Achilles, and her consolation by Agamemnon corresponds with two consolations of Thetis by Calliope and Poseidon. The speeches of lament are a type much favoured by Q., who has seven other examples: that of Dawn for Memnon (2.609-22), of Podalirius for Machaon (7.58-65), three for Paris, those of Hecabe (10.373-84), Helen (10.392-45), and Oenone (10.424-31), that of Andromache for Astyanax (13.272-86) and of Hecabe for Polyxena (14.289-301). As noted by Vian (II 16), Q.'s version of the present episode departs pointedly from that of Sophocles in *Ajax*, although it shows substantial indebtedness in the roles of Teucer, Tecmessa and Odysseus. The main differences are the absence of disagreement among the Greeks over the treatment of Ajax's body and the magnanimous attitude of Agamemnon, which is consistent with Q.'s tendency to idealise his heroes (thus Kakridis 64).

487-520: Mourning of the Greeks and Lament of Teucer

487-9 The Greeks gather at the sight of Ajax lying dead, whereas before they were afraid to approach him. 490-2 Falling round him face down, they cover their heads with dust and lament loudly. 493-6 As when lambs are taken from ewes for slaughter, and their mothers leap and bleat round the deserted pens, 497-9 so loud are the groans of the Greeks, causing the land and sea to echo. 500-2 Teucer wants to take his own life, but others remove his sword. 502-6 He weeps beside Ajax more intensely than a boy who never knew his father laments the death of his mother, pouring ashes over his head. 507-8 So Teucer walks round his dead brother uttering this lament. 509-10 "Ajax, what made you inflict suffering and death on yourself? 511-4 Was it to

encourage the Trojans to kill the Greeks? The Greeks will not have the same courage in war without you to protect them. 515-7 I do not want to go home, but to die here and be buried here with you. 518-20 I care more about the death of you, my pride, than whether my parents are still alive on Salamis."

487-99 The mourning of Ajax by the army, which is resumed briefly at 568-70, recalls the same of Achilles 3.388-421 and 504-14, with the following verbal echoes: **490-1 ἀμφὶ...ἀμφεχέοντο** ~ 3.412 χευάμενοι ᾔσχυναν ἄδην ψαμάθοισι κάρηνα; **491 πρηνέες ἐκχύμενοι** = 3.410; **492 καί σφιν ὀδυρομένων** = 3.514 (-οισι); **492 γόος...ἵκανεν** ~ 3.507 ἠχὴ δ' ἄσπετος ὦρτο δι' αἰθέρος ἀκαμάτοιο; **498-9 μέγα...θάλασσα** ~ 3.401 περὶ δ' ἔβρεμε βένθεα πόντου, 3.506 ἐπεβρόμεον νῆες. The one simile here is thematically different from the three in the corresponding passage: 3.392-8 the killing of Tityus by Apollo, 3.413-6 the sack of a city, 3.420-1 the wounding of Ares by Athena.

487-9 The contrast between gathering now at the sight of Ajax (**ἐσίδοντο**) and previous terror at the sight of him (**εἰσορόωντας**) recalls the earlier statement at 393-4 (ὁρόωντες). Kakridis (63) regards the implausibility of so many helpless witnesses to the suicide as a weakness in the narrative. Clearly there is a strong element of heroic convention here; cf. the similar statements about the reaction of the Trojans to Achilles before and after his death, 3.141-2 and 212-3. Also plausibility is assisted by Q.'s vagueness about location in this episode, which, while not explicitly isolating Ajax at the time of his suicide, does not exclude that and certainly does not imply that the Greeks stood and watched. Because of theatrical imperatives the isolation of Ajax is made quite explicit in Sophocles.

487 κίον ἀθρόοι = Ξ38, π361.

488 κείμενον ἐν κονίῃσι = 2.339, ~ 484 above.

489 ἔχεν δέος εἰσορόωντας ~ θάμβος δ' ἔχεν εἰσ. 3x in H.

490 κταμένῳ [v.l. -ου] **περικάππεσον** ~ 502 below; for the verb see 322-3 n.

491 <κόνιν> Rhodomann's supplement is certain; cf. Σ 23-24 (= ω 316-7), 3.412 for the gesture of pouring dust over one's head. A novel feature of the present statement is the play on transitive **ἀμφεχέοντο** preceded by intrans. **ἐκχύμενοι**.

492 σφιν ὀδυρομένων Rhodomann's emendation -οις, though it is in line with the parallel at 3.514 cited above (487-99n.), has rightly been rejected by most later editors because the corruption is implausible and the change not strictly necessary. A gen. participle as virtually a gen. absolute after a dat. pronoun occurs both in H. and Q. (see Chantraine, *GH* II 322-3 and Hermann, *Orphica* 800-2), though the present juxtaposition of forms is harsh and unusual; in the four other examples in Q. involving σφι(ν) or σφισι(ν) (see Vian and Battegay s.v.) the words are separated, but οἱ and gen. participle are juxtaposed 7.208, 319.

492 αἰθέρα δῖον ἵκανεν/ ~ αἰθέρ' ἵ./ 4x in H., ἐς α. δῖαν τ540, ἵκετ' α. δῖον 2.467.

493-6 This simile likening the mourning Greeks to ewes who grieve for the loss of their lambs is echoed with variation by another at 503-6 that likens Teucer to an orphaned child, and the theme of bereavement is developed further at 551-6, where Tecmessa in her lament predicts the fate of her child Eurysaces. The sequence amounts to an unusually subtle connection between similes and narrative. The present simile derives elements from various H. similes. For the removal of the lambs for human consumption, **ἵνα...κάμωνται 494**, cf. ω43 ἵνα δαῖτα λάβησιν, of a lion attacking sheep, and in Q. 13.140 δ....τεύχουσι, of jackals or wolves killing sheep. For the bleating of the ewes, **διηνεκέως μεμακυῖαι 495**, cf. and contrast Δ435 ἀζηχὲς μ. ἀκούουσαι ὄπα ἀρνῶν, of ewes at milking time. But the most important thematic model in H. is the simile at π 216-8 of birds calling for their stolen chicks. That is imitated more closely by Q. in two later similes: 7.330-5, a swallow searching for chicks that a snake has eaten; 12.489-94, a nightingale in the same situation. The transference of theme from birds to sheep in the present passage, which may be original, is obviously prompted by the preceding slaughter of sheep by Ajax.

493 εἰροπόκων ὀίων is a combination that occurs 2x in H. Rhodomann's two emendations in **495** are convincing: **μέγα σκαίρουσι** for μέγ' ἀσπαίρουσι, because the latter verb, in Q. as in H., is used only of the convulsive movement of the dying, and **διηνεκέως** for -έες, because an adverb is required by the syntax. In **ἐκ τεκέων...χηρωθέντας 496** χ. need not be felt as transferred since its application to impersonal subjects is well established. The word order gives suitable emphasis, esp. with juxtaposition of τ. with preceding μητέρες, which focuses on the separation of the mothers from their young. But the use of ἐκ instead of simple gen. of separation is very rare, seemingly an idiosyncracy of Q.; similar expressions occur 10.79, 12.127, 13.281-2, 286.

497 μέγα is preferable to the variant μέγαν because of the effective echo here and in 498 of the same form in 495.

498 πανσυδίῃ Combellack's 'all together' is the seemingly consistent meaning of the word in Q. (18x); see LSJ and Cunliffe, *LHD* for its disputed meaning in H.

498-9 The echoing of the Greeks' groaning by Mount Ida, the plain, the ships and the sea picks up the statement at 492 that the sound reached the sky, and is reflected at 569-70 by the echoing of the same by the Hellespont; for other parallels see 487-99n.

500-8 The most notable feature of the introduction to the lament of Teucer, apart from the extended simile 503-6, for which see *ad loc.* and 493-6n., is the prevention of his attempted suicide 500-2. The H. model for this is the restraining of Achilles by Antilochus, Σ 32-34, after reporting the death of

Patroclus, a theme elaborated later by Q. at 7.21-36, the intervention of Nestor in the grieving of Podalirius for his brother Machaon.
500 μήδετο is Rhodomann's palmary emendation of the MSS.' κήδετο, the corruption arising from the following word.
500-1 Κῆρας ἐπισπεῖν / ἀργαλέας is a possibly unique adaptation, with emphatic enjambment, of the H. formula πότμον ἐ. *et sim.*; its application to suicide is at least unusual.
501-2 Mention of a sword indicates that Teucer was about to take his own life in the same way as Ajax (cf. 483).
502 περικάππεσε τεθνειῶτι echoes 490 with variation; cf. 3.461 ἀμφιχυθεὶς δέμας ἠύ, of Phoenix and Achilles, the obvious counterparts of Teucer and Ajax.
503 /δάκρυα πολλὰ χέων ~ the H. formula (6x) /δ. θερμὰ χ., 1.301 μυρία δ. χεύει.
503 ἀδινώτερα νηπιάχοιο This qualification of δάκρυα as a comparative lead-in to the following simile is most unusual. Its obvious H. model is π216 κλαῖον...ἀδινώτερον ἤ τ' οἰωνοί, although the present simile is quite different. It is a good example of a probably subconscious association; see 493-6n.
503-6 The simile of a boy mourning the death of his mother, never having known his father, is best seen as a thematic reversal of the H. simile Ψ 222-3 (applied to the mourning Achilles), a father at the funeral of his son; note esp. **ὀδύρεται** 505 and Ψ222. Also possibly influential are the two similes of a wife mourning her husband θ 523-30, A.R. 3.656-63. The subject is unique among Q.'s similes.
504-5 The description of the boy with ashes covering head and shoulders is contextually apt after that of the Greeks throwing dust over their heads 490-1. Both descriptions are influenced by that of Achilles at Σ 23-25 in a passage otherwise influential here (see 500-8n.): grieving for Patroclus, he throws dust over his head and ashes on his tunic.
505 κὰκ κεφαλῆς reflects the same at Σ24. The natural association of ashes and hearth recurs 14.25-26, of the mourning Hecuba.
505 ὀρφανὸν ἦμαρ/ ~ Χ490 /ἦμαρ δ' ὀρφανικόν.
508 ἑρπύζων (~ 13.93) is the H. *mot juste* for the slow movement of a mourner (see LSJ s.v.).
508 ἔπος...τοῖον = 464.
509-20 After the rhetorical question 509-10, the lament of Teucer is occupied with two themes: 511-4 the vulnerability of the Greeks after Ajax's death, which is similar to Agamemnon's reflection on the same after Achilles' death, 3.494-8; 515-20 Teucer's loss of concern for returning to Salamis and for his parents' fate, which clearly refers to the tradition that the father of Ajax and Teucer, Telamon, drove Teucer into exile, as is anticipated explicitly and at some length in the lament given to Teucer by Sophocles (*Aj.* 1008-20). There is no substantial similarity between the

present lament and that of Teucer's counterpart in the mourning of Achilles, Phoenix, 3.463-89.

509 καρτερόθυμε ~ E277, voc. of Diomedes.

There is no justification for Vian's adoption, albeit hesitant, of Rhodomann's emendation **τί <δ>ἡ 509** of the MSS.' τίη; Lloyd-Jones (*CR* 17 [1967] 275) has shown that τίη introducing an impatient question and also its combination with νύ τοι are fully supported by H. usage (as regards Q.'s usage see Vian, *Rech.* 158).

509 ἔβλαβεν is a seemingly unparalleled second aor. act. of βλάπτω, based on the regular aor. pass. forms (see Vian *loc. cit.*).

510 <σ>οἱ αὐτῷ is Zimmermann's emendation, adopted by Vian and Pompella, of the MSS.' οἷ αὐτῷ. But οἷ as a second-person pronoun occurs 4x in the MSS. of Q. (see Vian and Battegay s.v. III), though usually emended to σοὶ (e.g. 533 below), and the usage is analogous both to the early epic ὅς, ἑός = σός and to the later ἑαυτόν = σεαυτόν, of which the present case is virtually an example. Accordingly emendation should be rejected here and at 533, *pace* Vian, who condemns the usage except when occasioned by metrical necessity (*Rech.* 168-9).

The middle active **βαλέσθαι 510** (consecutive infinitive) plus acc. and dat. = 'inflict on' is a usage that occurs 6x in Q. (cf. e.g. 602 below), but is hard to parallel. Perhaps it was originally a metaphor from the middle of βάλλω = 'put on', sc. one's body.

For **Τρώϊοι υἷες 511** see 177n.

511 ὀϊζύος ἀμπνεύσωσιν ~ 1.412.

514 πήματος ἄλκαρ/ ~ 3.565 ἄλκαρ ἀνίης/, said by Briseis of Achilles. But the conscious echo here is of 423 ἕρκος...πολέμοιο, applied to Ajax by Menelaus (see n. *ad loc.*).

515 ἐμοὶ νόστοιο τέλος = χ323. The expression ν. τ. appears to be modelled on the formulaic combination of τ. with θανάτοιο in H. and Q., as is suggested here by the following θανόντος.

515 δεῦρο must be equivalent to ἐνθάδ' 516. The usage seems to be isolated in epic, but is common in later prose, an example of the occasional influence of the latter on Q.

Vian's explanation of **516 ὀίομαι...ὀλέσθαι** as a wish is unconvincing and unnecessary. In H. usage the aor. inf. with various verbs frequently refers to the future (see Chantraine, *GH* II 279), and for the same with ὀίομαι in Q. cf. e.g. 4.577-8, 5.589-90. Pompella correctly translates "sono certo che...troverò morte."

The purpose clause **ὄφρα...ἀμφικαλύπτῃ 517** has virtually the force of a wish and is very similar to those expressed by Phoenix, 3.464 ὡς ὀφελόν με χυτὴ κατὰ γαῖα κεκεύθει, and by Briseis, 3.572-3 ὡς ὄφ. με / γαῖα χυτὴ ἐκάλυψε; cf. also 537 below for a further variation. The present version recalls, esp. with φερέσβιος, Γ243 (~λ301) τοὺς δ' ἤδη κάτεχεν φυσίζοος αἶα.

517 γαῖα φερέσβιος = *H.h.Apollo* 341; ~ 3.22, 8.466.
518-9 Teucer's indifference to his parents is in effective contrast with the preceding simile of the orphaned boy (503-6).
Spitzner's **εἴ που 518** for the MSS.' οἵ/εἴ πω is convincing, the immediate repetition of εἴ που ἔτ' 519 giving an appropriate note of insistence.
The further repetition in **ἔτι ζωοὶ 519**, which involves tautology after ἔτ' εἰσίν 518 (cf. 561 and 563), is more surprising, but does not justify emendation; it provides emphatic contrast with **σεῖο θανόντος 520**, which is repeated with variation from 515.
There is further echoing in **ἐπεὶ σύ...κῦδος 520** from 514 σὺ γὰρ...ἄλκαρ; the closing word κῦδος is a fitting intensification.

521-567: Tecmessa's Lament and Consolation by Agamemnon

521-5 The lamentation is taken up by Tecmessa, whom Ajax had made his wife in spite of her being a captive, with the rights of a lawfully wedded woman. 526-8 She had borne Eurysaces, his father's image, who, still an infant, was left in bed. 529-31 Wailing over the corpse, she covers herself with dust and cries aloud in her grief. 532-3 "Alas, you were not killed by an enemy but by yourself. 534-6 I grieve because the Fates have frustrated my hope of not seeing your death. 537-9 I wish the earth had covered me first, for no worse grief has ever afflicted me. 540-3 Not even when you took me captive from my home and I changed from lady to slave. 544-6 I do not care so much for loss of home as for the death of you who were always kind to me. 547-9 You made me your wife, but a god nullified your promise to make me mistress of Salamis. 550-3 Your death has removed your care for me and our son, who will not know and succeed his father, but will be enslaved. 553-6 Fatherless boys have a poor upbringing and a life filled with suffering. 557-8 And I shall soon be enslaved, now that you whom I worshipped are gone." 559-61 Agamemnon says, "No one will enslave you so long as Teucer and I are alive. 562-4 We shall honour you and your son just as when Ajax, our defence, was alive. 565-7 We all grieve that he took his own life, he whom the enemy could not destroy."
521-31 Much of the introduction to the lament of Tecmessa is concerned with two matters which foreshadow treatment of the same in the lament itself: first Tecmessa's status as Ajax's wife 522-5 and in the lament 547-9, and then their infant son Eurysaces 526-8 and in the lament 551-6. In both cases the major influence is H. and will be noted at the later passages. The influence of Sophocles' *Ajax* is confined to the following points and was not necessarily conscious: the statement that Tecmessa was Ajax's wife in spite of being a captive, 522-3, is made more succinctly at *Aj.* 894, τὴν δουρίληπτον δύσμορον νύμφην; the statement that Eurysaces has been left in bed 528 is in contrast to his being shown on stage at *Aj.* 550ff. Now that Ajax is dead, there is no scope for the kind of pathetic point made in the

play, and the presence of the child would detract from the intensity of Tecmessa's lament.
521 μέγα στενάχων ~ H. βαρὺ στ. (2x in Q.); ~ μέγα with στ. 9x in Q. including 529 below.
521 Ἐπὶ δ' ἔστενε = ω776.
For the Attic correption in the first syllable of **Τέκμησσα 521** (the name's only occurrence in Q.) see 374n.
For the scansion of **ἔμεν 524** as an iambus see 113n.
Pompella's defence of the MSS.' ὅσσων 524 against Vian's **<ὀπ>όσσων** does not answer the latter's observation (*Rech.* 233 n.2) that otherwise Q. always (9x) uses ὀπόσ. in this *sedes*.
524-5 γυναῖκες / ἑδνωταὶ as the counterpart of ἀνδράσι κουριδίοισιν 525 is a notable departure from the H. *hapax* ἐεδνωτής = 'marriage broker'; ἑδ. = 'lawfully married' is otherwise attested only by Hesychius.
Indicative **μεδέουσι 525** is a late usage on the analogy of the post-H. use of μέδω (see LSJ μεδέων); in H. and otherwise in Q. there are only the participles μέδων, μεδέων.
526 ἀκαμάτοισιν is Vian's emendation, adopted by Pompella, of MSS.' -ῃσιν. Vian emends similarly 4x elsewhere on the ground that the MSS. have -οισι(ν) fem. for this adj. 5x (see Vian and Battegay s.v. and Vian, *Rech.* 167). Such imposition of consistency is questionable.
526 ὑπ' ἀγκοίνῃσι δαμεῖσα/ ~ 8.98 ἐν. ἀ. δάμασσεν/.
527 ἐοικότα πάντα τοκῆι, said of the infant Eurysaces, is the kind of exaggeration readily made by parents, here transferred to the narrative; cf. Ajax's rather different wish, Sophocles, *Aj.* 550-1 ὦ παῖ, γένοιο πατρὸς εὐτυχέστερος,/ τὰ δ' ἄλλ' ὁμοῖος. The combination of ἔοικα with πάντα acc. of respect occurs 2x in H. and 3x in Q.
529 μέγα στενάχουσα, echoing 521 and linking the two laments, marks the return from digression on Tecmessa's background.
529 περικάππεσε νεκρῷ ~ 502, of Teucer.
Rhodomann's restoration **ἐντυπὰς <ἐν> κονίῃσι 530** is supported by the obvious models ω163 ἐ. ἐν χλαίνῃ (of the mourning Priam), A.R. 1.264 ἐ. ἐν λεχέεσσι (of the grieving Aison); cf. also 484 above.
530 καλὸν with short α, the normal Attic form, is exceptional in Q., who mostly follows H. in having it long, but cf. 7.440, 11.112 (see Vian, *Rech.* 171).
531 καί ῥ'...ἔνδον ~ 3.462 καί ῥ' ὁ. ἀ. μ. ἀ-ος πινυτὸν κῆρ, which introduces the lament of Phoenix. The present line is repeated precisely at 13.271, of Andromache; for its second half μέγ'...ἔνδον cf. 613 below. The form **κέαρ** is post-H.; Q. uses it 16x and H. κῆρ 30x.
532-58 Tecmessa's lament has the following broad thematic structure: 532-3 Ajax was killed not by the enemy but by himself; 534-8 Tecmessa did not expect to see Ajax die and wishes she had died first; 538-45 the loss

of Tecmessa's first home was not as bad as that of Ajax; 546-9 Ajax made Tecmessa his lawful wife; 550-8 Ajax's death will mean slavery for their son and for Tecmessa herself. It owes relatively little to the corresponding lament in Sophocles' *Ajax* (485-524), inevitable points of contact in subject matter (notably Tecmessa's anticipation of her own enslavement and the mistreatment of Eurysaces, *Aj.* 494-513) showing no sign of conscious imitation. To a marked degree the present lament follows the pattern of the lament of Briseis for Achilles 3.560-73, with emphasis on three points—that Ajax's death is a worse loss than that of her original family (538-45 ~ 3.561-3), that she had been given the status of wife (547-9 ~ 3.568), and that she will be reduced to slavery (557-8 ~ 3.569-72). Three other important influences are the lament of Phoenix for Achilles 3.463-89 for the wish that she had died first (537-9 ~ 3.464-6), the lament of Briseis for Patroclus in the *Iliad*, Τ 287-300, for her promised status in Salamis (547-9 ~ Τ 297-9), and the lament of Andromache for Hector in the *Iliad*, Χ 477-514, for the predicted ill treatment of Eurysaces (551-6 ~ Χ 484-99).

532-3 The point that Ajax was not killed by the enemy is a presumably unconscious reflection of his fated immunity from such a death, as stated 1.566-7 (see 482-4n.). That the contrast between this and his suicide became something of a commonplace is indicated by its treatment in the *Greek Anthology* (7.147, 148, 149), as Vian notes.

532 /"Ὤ μοι ἐγὼ = 465 (Ajax's first words when he comes to his senses), 3.560 (the beginning of Briseis' lament).

532 ἐγὼ δύστηνος = Χ477 (the beginning of Andromache's lament). For the emendation **<σ>οὶ αὐτῷ 533** see 510n.

534 /Τῷ...ἐποίχεται = 7.64; for the spelling of the epic particle see LSJ τῷ.

The expression **πένθος ἄλαστον 534** occurs 2x in H.

535 /σεῖο καταφθιμένοιο = Χ288, 7.270; ~ 3.495.

535 πολύστονον ἦμαρ ἰδέσθαι, which is unique in Q., ~ νόστιμον ἦ. ἰ. 3x in H. π. ἦ. ~ 1.689; for the type of expression see 378n.

536 κακαὶ...Κῆρες is Rhodomann's emendation of κ....χεῖρες; similar corruption occurs in the MSS. of Q. also 3.41, 3.349, 10.37, 10.251, 13.177. Vian's insistence that Κ. here = 'fates', not 'deities of death', makes a distinction that is not clearly indicated by Q.'s very frequent use of the word.

536 διὰ...ἔχευαν has the metaphorical sense 'confound', for which see LSJ s.v. I 3; it is a synonym of the much commoner metaphorical συγχέω, found in H. and Q.—cf. esp. Δ269 σύν γ' ὅρκι' ἔχευαν/. Vian's suggestion of the image of a scattered fleet is misguided.

537-9 ~ 3.464-6 in the lament of Phoenix, with the second and third lines identical in both cases, an unusually long repetition.

A variation of **"Ὡς μ'...ἀμείλιχον 537-8** is 3.572-3 in the lament of Briseis.

For 537 **῞Ως μ'...γαῖα** see 517n. and cf. the H. formula (2x) τότε μοι χάνοι εὐρεῖα χθών.
For adv. **῞Ως...ὄφελον 537** see 206n.
For **τὸ πάροιθε 537** see 148n.
537 περὶ...χάνε in the trans. sense 'swallowed' may be an innovation in epic (see LSJ s.v. II); possibly influential are the words of Hector to Andromache Z 464-5 ἀλλά με τεθνηῶτα χυτὴ κατὰ γαῖα καλύπτοι,/ πρίν γ'...
As regards the application of **τραφερὴ 537** to γαῖα, Vian (I 63 n.3) shows that this is an example of the post-H. meaning 'nourishing' by comparing γαῖα φερέσβιος 517.
540 ἐμῆς...πάτρης/ ~ τηλόθι π./ 6x in H.; τ. plus gen. 2x in Q., ἀπὸ τ. plus gen. 3x in Q.
541 ἅμ' ἄλλαις ληιάδεσσι/ = 13.265; here it recalls for the reader 522-3.
542 /πόλλ' ὀλοφυρομένην = ν221 (-ος), 2.644 (-ους).
For the statement of Tecmessa's previous change of status **ἐπεὶ...ἦμαρ 542-3** cf. Sophocles, *Aj.* 487-9 ...νῦν δ' εἰμὶ δούλη.
The combination **ἐπεὶ ἦ νυ 542** occurs 8x in Q.; cf. ἐπεὶ ἦ and ἐπεί νυ in H. and Q.
542 τὸ πρὶν is a H. combination that Q. uses otherwise 1.505, 9.485 (see Svensson, 86).
543 δούλιον ἦμαρ occurs 3x in H., 5x in Q.; for a variation cf. 557 below.
544 πάτρης θυμηδέος is a stronger variation on the regular application of φίλη to πατρίς by H. and to πατρίς and πάτρη by Q.
545 οἰχομένων = θανόντων; for the post-H. usage cf. 558 below, 8.401.
546 μοι δειλῇ is noted by Wifstrand (45) as one of just nine cases in Q. of a spondaic word before the penthemimeral caesura preceded by a postpositive.
546 θυμήρεα πάντα may be a novel expression, perhaps chosen for the echo of πάτρης θυμηδέος 544.
547 καί...ἄκοιτιν = 3.568 in the lament of Briseis; here the addition of ὁμόφρονα, possibly a novel combination, adds a touch of affection.
Vian's change of word division, **με θῆκας 547** and 3.568 for μ' ἔθηκας, improves the rhythm.
Rhodomann's restoration of metre with **<ῥά μ'> 547** gives pleasing repetition within the line, and underlines the parallel between Tecmessa's status and Ajax's affection for her.
548 /τεύξειν...ἄνασσαν echoes 524 /τεῦξεν ἄ. of Tecmessa, and more immediately marks a pointed parallel with 542 τὸ πρὶν ἄ.

548 ἐυκτιμένης Σαλαμῖνος ~ *H.h.* 10.4 Σ. ἐ.; of Q.'s three other uses of this H. epithet of cities cf. ἐ-ην...Λῆμνον 9.334.
In **549** the sentence ending with mention of Troy and followed by a contrasted statement Τὰ δ'... repeats the pattern of 536.
Rhodomann's emendation **νῦν μὲν 550** in place of MS. H's unmetrical μὲν is confirmed by MS. P's unmetrical μὲν νῦν (unknown to R.) as well as by the almost identical statement in Phoenix's lament, 3.480 /νῦν δὲ δὴ οἴχῃ ἄιστος, and it is preferable to Lloyd-Jones' desperate expedient (*CR* 17 [1967] 275) μὲν νῦν ᾄστος.
550-1 οὐδέ νυ σοί περ / μέμβλετ' ἐμεῦ is a subtle variation on 544-5 'Αλλά μοι οὔτε.../μ.
551 καὶ παιδός, ὅς... gives a smooth transition to the new topic of Eurysaces' fate.
551 οὐ πατρὶ τέρψεται ἦτορ, "his heart will have no joy in a father" (Combellack). Vian and Battegay wrongly attribute the active sense 'réjouir' uniquely to the middle τ. here. In fact the construction is just a slight variation of the H. use of middle τ. plus dat. and acc. φρένα (once κῆρ α310); otherwise in Q. plus φρένας 9.53.
552 κοιρανίης ἐπιβήσεται is possibly a unique expression; closest is the H. metaphorical use of ἐ. plus gen. = 'enter a state, condition', ἀναιδείης χ424, ἐυφροσύνης ψ52.
554 /νηπίαχοι κομέονται ~ 3.472 /ν-ον κομέειν, A.R. 2.510 /ν-ον...κομέεσθαι/.
554 εὖ μάλα πολλὸν/ is a remarkably emphatic intensification of the following comparative adj. in enjambment; its negative impact is a surprise at the end of the sentence. εὖ is read only by MS. P, but need not be questioned; for the combination, in which εὖ μάλα = μάλιστα (thus Vian, *Rech.* 151), see LSJ εὖ II.
556 MSS. are divided between **παισὶ** (P) and πᾶσι (H). The former was anticipated by Glasewald's emendation and may seem self-evidently superior, but an element of doubt is introduced by comparison with 7.67-68 Πᾶσι μὲν ἀνθρώποισιν ἶσον κακὸν ὤπασε δαίμων / ὀρφανίην, Q.'s only other use of ὀ.
556 πήματ' ἐπ'...χέονται The expression is similar to the application by H. and Q. of χέω and its compounds to immaterial things, e.g. ω445 ἐφ' ὕπνον ἔχευε.
557 echoes 542-3.
558 οἰχομένου σέο πρόσθεν by echoing the statement at 550 gives a sense of closure. Also the whole line closely resembles 520, the end of Teucer's lament, in both content and structure.
The force of **θεὸς ὣς 558** is strong, unlike such conventional expressions as e.g. ἀντιθέου Αἴαντος 564; for the form of comparison cf. Ε78, Θ467, 1.107, 9.332.

559-67 For the seemingly spontaneous warmth of Agamemnon's support of Tecmessa, in contrast to his role in Sophocles' *Ajax*, see above the conclusion of the introduction to 487-663. At his last appearance 413-32 Agamemnon defends Odysseus against Menelaus' charge of presumption, but tacitly accepts the latter's high regard for Ajax.
559 / Ὣς φαμένην προσέειπε = 14.165; it is not a H. combination.
559 φίλα φρονέων occurs 6x in H., 4x in Q.
560-1 Koechly emends the first **ἔτι** to ποτε partly to avoid its repetition, but that may well be for intended effect—underlining of the parallel; cf. its double repetition 518-9. Secondly he believes it would be too strong a hint that Tecmessa is already the slave of Ajax. But that is unnecessary if the emphatic repetition is understood as purely temporal—"in future...as long as...", and ἄλλος is contrasted not with Ajax but with those named next.
562-3 Repetition of τίσομεν expresses insistent reassurance.
563 τίσομεν ὥς τε θεήν may sound exaggerated, but is a neat complement to Tecmessa's last words ὅ μοι θεὸς ὣς ἐτέτυξο 558 (echoed by ἀντιθέου A. 564); ~ I603 ἶσον γάρ σε θεῷ τίσουσιν 'Αχαιοί, said by Phoenix to Achilles. For the form **θεήν** see 3n.
563-4 ἔτ' ἐόντος/...Αἴαντος is a chiastic variation on 561 T. ἔτι ζώοντος; cf. 518-9.
564 ὃς...'Αχαιῶν echoes Teucer's claim for Ajax at 514 and leads into Agamemnon's final point that Ajax, who died by his own hand, could not be killed by the enemy **565-7**, which is the same as the opening point of Tecmessa's lament, 532-3, and so is an example of ring composition to close the passage.
564 κάρτος 'Αχαιῶν/ = P623.
565 ἄλγος 'Αχαιίδι θήκατο ~ A2 'Αχαιοῖς ἄλγε' ἔθηκεν; there is no obvious reason for the middle verb.
566-7 ἀπείρων/...λαὸς ~ Ω776 δῆμος ἀ., 10.91 ἀπείρονι λαῷ; the expression here is in pointed contrast with αὐτὸς...χειρὶ 566.
567 ὑπ' Ἄρεϊ δῃώσασθαι/ ~ 6.453; the expression is not H.

568-597 Mourning of the Greeks and Lament of Odysseus

568-70 After that the Hellespont echoes with the renewed lamentation of the army. 571-3 Their grief is shared by Odysseus also, who addresses them. 574-7 "Anger is the greatest cause of conflict, and it has roused Ajax against me. 577-81 I wish the Trojans had not awarded me a victory that has led to Ajax's suicide. 581-2 Not I but Fate has caused his anger and death. 583-8 If I had anticipated the effect on him, I would not have contended for victory or allowed any other Greek to do so, but I would willingly have given him the armour and anything else he wanted. 589-93 I did not expect his anger, because it was a contest not over a woman or wealth, but over prowess, which is welcome to sensible people. 594-7 Fate caused him to do wrong, since excessive grief is unseemly and a wise man can bear up under great suffering."

A sense of symmetry is given to the whole lamentation sequence by repetition here from 487-520 of the pattern of general mourning followed by an individual lament. But relative length of components is drastically changed: a thirteen-line description of general mourning (487-99) is followed by a nine-line description of Teucer (500-8) and a lament of twelve lines (509-20); this time just three lines apiece are devoted to general mourning and Odysseus' introduction (568-70, 571-3), and twenty-four lines to Odysseus' lament (574-97). Another light in which the whole sequence can be viewed is that two expected laments from close associates of Ajax, Teucer and Tecmessa, are followed by one from a person who is unexpected as a mourner in view of his implication, at least indirectly, in the death of the mourned. It is hardly fanciful to see this as reflecting, perhaps unconsciously, the pattern of Hector's mourning in ω, in which the laments of Andromache (ω 725-45) and Hecuba (ω 748-59) are followed by that of Helen (ω 762-75). The fact that Odysseus, unlike Teucer and Tecmessa, does not apostrophise Ajax but addresses the company, appropriately reflects his greater emotional detachment.

568 = 3.504, which concludes Agamemnon's lament for Achilles.

568 ἀχνύμενος κέαρ ἔνδοθεν ~ 521 with ἔνδον, which shows the purely metrical function of -θεν here and 3.504 (see Campbell on 12.534).

568-9 'Αμφὶ...ἀνεστονάχησαν ~ 321 στονάχησε δὲ λαός, the army's reaction to the judgement, which can thus be seen as a kind of foreshadowing.

For the use of adv. **οἰκτρὸν 569** cf. H. οἶκτρ' ὀλοφυρόμεν- (4x).

569 ἐπίαχε δ' 'Ελλήσποντος/ = 3.585, ~ 3.601, both in the description of the Nereids bewailing Achilles, where the motif recalls its earlier use 3.401, λαῶν μυρομένων· περὶ δ' ἔβρεμε βένθεα πόντου, just as in the present context it recalls 498-9, the echoing of the army's lamentation by Ida, the plain, the ships and the sea.

570 For the emphatic placing of **ὀλοὴ** first and **ἀνίη** last see 39n.

570 περὶ...πέπτατ' ἀνίη/ ~ 6.496 περιπέπτατ' ὀιζύς/; the expression may be novel.

571 Καὶ δ' αὐτὸν, emphatically placed, calls attention to the unexpected role of Odysseus as a mourner.

For **μητιόωντα 571** see 135n.

572 ἀχνύμενος κατὰ θυμὸν ~ ἀ. κῆρ 10x in H., ἀ. κ. θ. 4x in Q., with variations e.g. 428, 579-80. In the present context the expression's close similarity to that in 568 indicates sympathy between Odysseus and Agamemnon, as does the further variation **ἀκηχεμένοισιν 573** between Odysseus and his audience.

573 /τοῖον ἔπος μετέειπεν = 9.536, ~ H. /τοῖσι δὲ καὶ μ.

574-97 The lament of Odysseus, though strongly sympathetic for Ajax, concludes with restrained moral criticism. Odysseus' role here is compatible with that in Sophocles' *Ajax* (1316-75), but essentially different, because denial of proper funeral honours simply does not arise as an issue as it does

in the play. Odysseus' expression of sympathy follows in essentials that at λ 548-60, Odysseus' encounter with the shade of Ajax, i.e. regret that he had won a victory which caused the death of so great a hero, the wish that Ajax could forget his anger, and attribution of ultimate blame to Zeus' hostility towards the Greeks. The development of thought is as follow: 574-7, there is no greater evil than anger (χόλος), which promotes strife (δῆρις) among men, as in the present case—a close reflection of Σ 107-11, Achilles' denunciation of ἔρις (=δῆρις) and χόλος and recognition of the latter's mastery over himself; 577-81, he wishes he had not won a victory leading to Ajax's suicide; 581-2, the cause of anger was not Odysseus, but fate (Αἶσα); 583-8, if he had anticipated Ajax's reaction, he would not have disputed the prize or allowed anyone else to do so—palpably insincere in its exaggeration; 589-93, Ajax's anger was unexpected because the contest was not over some great material reward, but about prowess (ἀρετή)—the obvious misjudgement of Ajax's values, indeed of the Greek heroic code, is a touch of irony that may or may not be conscious on the part of Odysseus; 594-7, fate (Αἶσα) caused Ajax to err, since a wise man (ἀνὴρ πινυτός) does not give way to grief, but endures with steadfast heart and mind. The expression of this last principle, 596-7, repeats, in almost the same words, 3.8-9, where it is applied to Nestor's bearing of his son Antilochus' death. Conscious recollection of that passage is clearly intended, because Nestor's intervention, with mention of Antilochus, follows immediately, 600 ff. Vian (I xvii) notes that Q. makes Nestor his regular mouthpiece for Stoic sentiments, and Kakridis (64) sees in the present passage expression of the Stoic ideal of ἀπάθεια.

For "**Ὦ φίλοι...γίνεται 574-5** see 166-7n.

The exclamatory **ὡς 574** is a point of likeness to the influential passage Σ 107-11.

574 κακώτερον ἄλλο occurs 3x in H.; ~ 9.94, 10.380.

575-6 ὅς τε...ὃς... introduce resp. general and particular statements about anger and reflect the pattern of Σ 108-9 χόλος, ὅς τ'...ὅς τε...

575 -οῖσι...ἀέξει/ = 7.168 (-ξων), ~ ξ65.

576 Αἴαντα πελώριον = P174, 4.264; see 385n.

576 ἐξορόθυνεν/ = *Cypria* 7.9 (Davies); it is not H., but occurs 3x in Q.

577 χολούμενον echoes χόλοιο 574 and gives suitable emphasis at the end of the long sentence.

For **'Ὡς ὄφελον 577** used adv. see 206n.

For **Τρώιοι υἷες 578** see 177n.

579 νίκην ἀμφεβάλοντ' (with μοι 577) = 'put on' metaphorically, an example of Q.'s tendency to use a middle verb when an active would be expected; see LSJ s.v. I c.

579 /νίκην...ἐρικυδέα = 9.277, ~ 14.86.

579-80 θυμὸν / ἀχνύμενος ~ 572.

For **πάις...Τελαμῶνος 580** see 482n.
581 ὤλετο χερσὶν <ἐ>ῆσι ~ 566.
581-2 Χόλου...ἐδάμνα. Odysseus' disclaimer of responsibility carries the more conviction because it has been anticipated by Agamemnon's assurance to Menelaus 428-31; cf. esp. 430 οὐ γὰρ ὅ γ' αἴτιός ἐστιν. Its obvious H. model is Agamemnon's disclaimer T 86-88, which it follows closely in form of expression; cf. also 9.414-6.
582 Αἶσα πολύστονος = 11.272 (Α....π.), ~ Λ73 Ἔρις...π.; it corresponds with Μοῖρα T87 and ἀλεγεινὰς / Μοίρας 9.415-6.
583-8 Odysseus' elaborate protestation of readiness to give up the armour of Achilles to Ajax is hardly convincing in the light of the foregoing contest, but it can be regarded as foreshadowing his subsequent willing surrender of the same to Neoptolemus, 7.194 ff.
The redundancy of the expression **κέαρ...στέρνοισιν 583** is shown by comparison with 531 and 568. A precisely parallel expression is used 171, seemingly for special emphasis (see n. *ad loc.*), and the same may be true here.
For **ἐριδμαίνων 585** see 128n.
The variant **ἀλλά οἱ 587** was anticipated by Rhodomann's preferred emendation of MS. H's unmetrical ἀλλ' ἄγε.
587 θεουδέα τεύχε' ~ *H.h.* 28.15 θεοείκελα τεύχη/; θεουδής in H. and A.R. = 'god-fearing', but in Q. (3x) = θεοειδής, possibly an innovation (see LSJ s.v.).
The MSS.' ἔασα 588 is not impossible, but weak after ἔασα 586, which probably produced the corruption; Tychsen's palmary emendation **ὄπασσα** was anticipated by MS. R's /ὤπασα προφρονέως, which produces unsatisfactory scansion after the caesura as well as loss of ἄν.
589-93 Odysseus' claim not to have expected Ajax's anger in view of the fact that the contest was not about material wealth but about recognition of prowess is seen by Vian as an imitation of A.R. 1.1339-42, where Jason says he does not resent Telamon's anger, since it was not about material wealth but about a companion (sc. the inadvertent abandonment of Heracles). Influence is likely, but the details of content and expression are not close enough to establish conscious imitation.
590 γυναικὸς is ambiguous, 'woman' or 'wife', and may refer to Helen, Briseis or Tecmessa.
591 πτόλιος and **εὐρέος ὄλβου** both refer most naturally to Troy and amount to hendiadys.
The repetition of **οὔ τι ἔγωγε 589** from 581 (cf. οὔτ' ἂν ἔγωγε 584, αὐτὸς ἔγωγε 587) contributes to the consistent tone of protestation.
For **χαλεπῆναι / ὠισάμην 589-90** with aor. inf. referring to the future see 516n.
591 εὐρέος ὄλβου is possibly a new combination; cf. H. κλέος εὐρύ.
592-3 ἀλλά...ἀνθρώποισι echoes the words of Laertes ω 514-5, ἦ

μάλα χαίρω·/ υἱός θ' υἱωνός τ' ἀρετῆς πέρι δῆριν ἔχουσιν. It can also be taken as alluding to the duel between Ajax and Hector in H., esp. Ajax's expression of pleasure H 191-2.

593 εὐφροσιν ἀνθρώποισι/ ~ Xenophanes 1.13 εὔφρονας ἄνδρας/, but with the adj. in a different sense (see 157n.).

The qualification **ἐσθλὸς ἐὼν 594** reminds the reader of 476 ἐσθλὸν ἐόντα said by Ajax about himself, unknown to Odysseus.

594 στυγερῇ ὑπὸ Δαίμονος Αἴσῃ/ = 9.502 (without adj.), 10.396 (ὀλοῇ); ~ *H.h.* 2.300 δ. α. /, λ61 δ. αἶσα κακή, δ. ἀ. 4x in Q.; here it recalls Odysseus' words at 582. Combellack's separation of ὑπὸ Δαίμονος from στυγερῇ...Αἴσῃ—"under the influence of a supernatural power...in the eyes of a hateful Fate"—is misguided.

595 ἀσχαλάαν ἐνὶ θυμῷ/ = 606; ~ ἀσχαλόων ἐ. θ./ 5x in Q., not in H.

As noted above, **596-7 ἀνδρὸς...ἀκάχησθαι** closely echoes the words of Nestor at 3.8-9, with the same opening phrase both times.

597 τλῆναι ὑπὸ κραδίῃ ~ υ18 τέτλαθι δή, κραδίη, ε222 τλήσομαι ἐν στήθεσσιν.

597 στερεῇ φρενὶ = 9.508 (...τλῆναι); ~ 2.265 στερεῇσιν...φρεσὶ, ψ103 κραδίη στερεωτέρη.

598-617 Nestor's Advice and Preparation of the Corpse

599-600 That said and the lamentation finished, Nestor addresses the Greeks. 601-5 "The Fates have added grief to grief with the deaths of Ajax, Achilles, Antilochus and others. 605-9 It is not fitting to mourn the slain for ever. Now we must perform the due rites of burning and burial. 610-1 The dead have no perception and cannot be woken by lamentation." 612-5 In response the kings together carry Ajax to the ships. 615-7 They wash the blood from the corpse and dress it.

The initiative of Nestor at this juncture is a close reflection of his role in the mourning and funeral of Achilles 3.514-25, except that there, in a rather shorter speech, he appeals to Agamemnon to take charge of the preparation of the corpse, about which he is more explicit. There is no equivalent in the H. narrative of the corresponding procedure for Patroclus; at Ψ109ff. Agamemnon without prompting takes the initiative in preparing the pyre. In the present passage Nestor's emphasis on self-control and moderation in grief follows naturally the final observation made by Odysseus 595-7, and it is also in keeping with his own stoic character, particularly as displayed after the death of his son Antilochus 3.1-9. That recent event is recalled at 3.516-7 in the narrative introduction to the speech of Nestor referred to above, and here the emphatic mention of Antilochus 604-5 (after the natural progression from the deaths of Ajax and Achilles to those of the Greeks in general) is an important feature of the speech, giving the speaker moral authority. Later the same subject is exploited by Nestor at much greater length in his speech of consolation to Podalirius over the death of his brother Machaon 7.38-55, which also shares with the present speech the

theme of resignation and restraint, including the commonplace of the impossibility of raising the dead—**610 Νεκρὸς...ἀνέγρεται** ~ 7.41 οὐ γὰρ ἀναστήσεις μιν ἔτ' ἐς φάος, Ω551 οὐδέ μιν ἀνστήσεις (Achilles to Priam re Hector), Sophocles, *Scyr.* 557.2 (Radt) τὸν θανόντα δακρύοις ἀνιστάναι.

598 Ὣς...ἀντιθέοιο = 317, the concluding line of the contest.

599 refers back to the general mourning at 568-70.

599 κορέσαντο...αἰνοῦ ~ 3.521 κλαυθμοῦ...κορέσασθαι (in Nestor's speech), υ59 κλαίουσα κορέσσατο.

601-2 Attribution of present suffering to the **Κῆρες** recalls 536 in Tecmessa's lament.

601 " **Ὦ φίλοι, ὡς...** (exclamatory) echoes 574, the opening of Odysseus' lament.

601 Κῆρες...ἔχουσαι/ ~ ἀνηλέι Κηρί 10.101, 251 (cf. 12.159), ἀ....θυμῷ 3.30, ἀπηνέα θυμὸν ἔχουσα/ ψ97.

Rhodomann's emendation **αἶψ' ἐβάλοντο 602** of MSS.' αἶψα β. is supported by Koechly's observation (*prol.* xxxv) that in the second foot Q. prefers to elide disyllabic words with following quadrisyllables; he emends similarly at 660. For ἐβάλοντο plus dat. and acc. = 'inflict' see 510n.

602 ἐπὶ πένθεϊ πένθος = 7.252, 10.373; ~ Σ130 ἐφ' ἕλκεϊ ἕλκος.

603-5 Αἴαντος...Ἀντιλόχου reflects γ109-12, where Nestor recalls to Telemachus the deaths (in this order) of Ajax, Achilles, Patroclus and Antilochus, with emphasis on the last.

603 = 6.21, said by Menelaus as a reason for withdrawing from Troy.

603 πολυσθενέος π. occurs 10x in Q., not in H.

605 κταμένους ἐνὶ χάρμῃ/ ~ ἀποκταμένους (-ων) ἐ. χ./ 3x in Q.

606 ἤματα πάντα is a H. formula (31x) and used 7x by Q.

606 ἀσχαλάαν ἐνὶ θυμῷ/ = 595, another echo of Odysseus' lament; see 601n.

607 Ἀλλὰ...ἀεικέος ~ 3.519 in Nestor's speech. Rhodomann's emendation of **λήσασθε 607** to -αι, adopted by Koechly and Zimmermann, to avoid hiatus, is palaeographically and syntactically justifiable, if one punctuates with a comma at the end of 606. But that is stylistically weaker than a new sentence with imperative, and the hiatus is not objectionable (see 152n.).

608 ἔοικε stands in effective contrast to ἀεικέος 607.

609 The pair of accusatives and the infinitive phrase act as an explanation of the preceding clause.

610 ἀνέγρεται is a late present form, found before in Oppian, *Hal.* 2.204; see LSJ ἐγείρω.

611 εὖτέ...ἀμφιχάνωσιν/ = 1.591 (ὄφρα σε...), ~ Ψ 78-79 ἐμὲ μὲν Κὴρ / ἀμφέχανε στυγερή. The similarity to 601-2 amounts to ring composition in the speech, first as the cause of endless mourning, but now as a reason for ending it.

612 /῏Η ῥα παρηγορέων ~ A.R. 2.1196 /ἴσκε π.; for π. see Campbell on A.R. 3.303 (comm. 1994).
612 ἀντίθεοι βασιλῆες/ ~ 4.180 /ἀ-ον -ῆα, διοτρεφέες β./ 3x in H., not in Q.
613 μέγ'...ἔνδον/ = 531 (ἀχ-η).
614 θοῶς ποτὶ νῆας is Koechly's emendation, adopted by Zimmermann and Vian, but not by Pompella, of MSS.' θοὰς π. ν. Koechly cites close parallels in Q. for the expression and sees appropriate contrast between μέγαν and θοῶς...ἔνεικαν. However, the notion of a large body carried with speed amounts to bathos, and Koechly's condemnation of θοὰς as otiose is not justified in terms of Q.'s usage, which follows H. with θ. as a regular epithet of ships. Thus, although corruption would be easy here, there is no case for emendation.
615-7 The brief statement of the washing and dressing of the corpse follows in essentials the same for Patroclus Σ 343-53 and for Achilles ω 43-45, 3.526-32, but without noteworthy similarity of detail.
615 Κατὰ...κάλυψαν/ occurs 4x in H., but not otherwise in Q.
615 σπείροισι is Brodeau's generally adopted emendation of MSS.' σπείρεσσι. But, as Vian notes, the latter is a rare but correct form (see LSJ σπεῖρος), and should therefore be restored.
616 ἀποφαιδρύναντες is Rhodomann's palmary emendation of the MSS.' unmetrical ἀποκαθήραντες, which is likely to have originated as a gloss on the rare word, possibly under the influence of ω44 καθήραντες in one of the relevant H. passages noted above; for the rare verb cf. 8.487 ἀποφαιδρύναντο, and 9.467 φαιδρύναντο in a context similar to the present.
616 βριαροῖς μελέεσσι/ = 4.461, 11.410; ~ H. formula (6x) γναμπτοῖσι μέλεσσι/.
617 σὺν ἔντεσιν <ἐν> κονίησι is Vian's emendation; it supposes loss of ἐν by haplography and its replacement by καὶ (*Rech.* 208), but the change is unnecessary. The MSS.' σὺν ἔ. καὶ κ., retained by Pompella, links armour and dust with blood as the subject of περίκειτο. Koechly emends by reversing the positions of σὺν and καὶ, to give slightly better sense, linking armour with limbs as the object of π., and dust alone with blood. But the supposed corruption is hardly plausible, and the MSS.' reading is at least acceptable, though it is strange to speak of armour covering the body in the same way as blood and dust.

618-636 Preparation of the Funeral Pyre

618-9 Wood is brought from Mount Ida, and the Greeks process around the corpse. 620-4 The wood is piled together with sacrificial victims and possessions of Ajax. 625-33 The Greeks also honour Ajax by putting on the pyre precious amber, which is said to have been made by Helius in honour of his son Phaethon, from the tears shed in mourning by his

daughters beside the river Eridanus. 633-6 In mourning the Greeks also place ivory, silver, jars of oil and many other things that constitute wealth.

The brief mention of a funeral procession inserted at 619 loosely reflects those at ω69 and 3.695-6 of the funeral procession for Achilles. But its position here, immediately after the gathering of timber, corresponds with that of the more elaborate description of Patroclus' funeral procession Ψ128-34, whereas the procession at 3.694-6 follows the whole description of the pyre. The present descriptive list of the pyre's components—wood from Mount Ida, sheep, clothes, cattle, horses, gold, armour of slain enemies, amber, ivory, silver, jars of oil, *et al.*— is a close reflection of the corresponding list for Achilles' pyre 3.672-93: wood from Mount Ida, armour and bodies of slain Trojans, horses, bulls, sheep, pigs, clothes, gold, amber (? or electrum), cut hair of the Myrmidons and Briseis, jars of oil, honey and wine, *et al.*, much of which is indebted to the description of Patroclus' pyre Ψ 110-27, 135-53, 163-76, as well as to the brief one of Achilles' pyre ω 65-68. In both of his descriptions Q. adds to the H. lists of offerings without considering that some of the items are not combustible, as is noted by Vian (I 122 n.2). In the present description the most striking departure and touch of originality is the elaborate mythological digression on the origin of amber 625-30. It is in the spirit of other such digressions in this book, but its subject matter, mourning and tears (Phaethon corresponds with Ajax), contributes more effectively than that of some to the mood of the passage.

618 'Ἰδαίων ὀρέων occurs 10x in H. and 6x in Q. For the motif of cutting wood from mountains see G.W. Bond on Euripides, *Her.* 240ff. (ed. 1981).

For **ἄσπετον ὕλην/ 618** see 389n.

619 νέκυν πέρι δινήσαντο is Pauw's slight correction, adopted by Vian and Pompella, of the MSS.' ν. περι-, in preference to Rhodomann's hazardous emendation, adopted by Koechly and Zimmermann, ν. π. νηήσαντο, "heaped around the body" (thus Combellack), an unnecessary change of the action to form part of the preparation of the pyre. The background of the MSS.' reading, partly identified by Vian, is X165 τρὶς Πριάμοιο πόλιν πέρι δινηθήτην, of Achilles and Hector, which A.R. adapted with τρὶς περὶ (ἀμφὶ)...δινηθέντες (1.1059, 4.1535) to ceremonial circling as part of funeral honours. Keydell (*Gnomon* 40 [1968] 572) correctly criticises Vian's inconsistency in understanding the verb to mean "aller et venir autour de", which reflects a different H. use of it, but he offers no cogent objection to Vian's reading: it does not leave Πάντῃ 619 without appropriate meaning, "all (round)", nor is the seeming innovation of the aor. middle verb in place of aor. passive extraordinary, esp. in view of Q.'s general favour of middle forms.

621 /φάρεά τ' εὐποίητα = 7.683 (gifts to Neoptolemus), ~ ν369 /εἵματα τ' ε.

621 βοῶν...φῦλα ~ 6.324 μελισσάων κλυτὰ φ.; φ. is applied to animals from H. on.
622 οἱ, unnecessarily emended by Rhodomann to καὶ, refers to Ajax, as does αὐτῷ 620 (cf. 633). Vian takes it as possessive, but it may rather express interest.
622 ἀγαλλομένους ποσὶν, a permanent characteristic of dead horses, is a curious adaptation of Β462 ἀ-α πτερύγεσσι, of birds actually flying.
623 /χρυσόν τ' αἰγλήεντα ~ A.R. 4.1142 /χρύσεον α-εν κῶας; for Q.'s use of the adj. in general see Campbell on 12.104.
623-4 The armour of slain enemies both reflects and differs pointedly from 3.678-80, where Trojan victims are sacrificed in addition, in keeping with Achilles' sacrifice of the same Ψ 175-6.
623 τεύχεα φωτῶν occurs 2x in H. and 4x in Q.
623-4 τεύχεα...ὅσσα...ἀποαίνυτο ~ αἴνυτο τεύχε' ἀπ' ὤμων 2x in H.
624 φαίδιμος ἀνήρ/ ~ 13.276 φ-ον ἄνδρα/, φ. Αἴας 6x in H. and 1x in Q.
625 ἤλεκτρόν τ' is separated from χρυσόν τ' 623, whereas in the corresponding list at 3.685 the two are juxtaposed, as in the H. model δ73 (also with silver and ivory, cf. 634 below). In the last two passages the meaning of ἤλεκτρον is uncertain, either the natural alloy of gold and silver or amber, but here the latter is indicated by the following digression. For the suitable epithet of amber **διειδέα 625**, here = 'translucent' rather than 'transparent', see 79n. Its synonym διαυγής is applied by Q. to gold 3.732; cf. A.R. 4.605-6 φαεινὰς / ἠλέκτρου λιβάδας.
625-30 Q.'s version of the myth of the origin of amber from the tears of the Heliades mourning the death of their brother Phaethon is clearly dependent on that at A.R. 4.603-11, part of a longer aetiological digression, although close verbal similarity is largely avoided. Vian notes the influence of that passage on Q. elsewhere (2.564-6, 10.192-4) and cites other versions of the myth; see J. Diggle, *Euripides, Phaethon* (1970) 5ff. Vian's observation that the present passage differs from its source in the personification of Helius may not be strictly correct, since his chariot is mentioned A.R. 4.598, but certainly the prominence of Helius as an active agent is a notable difference.
626 Ἠελίοιο πανομφαίοιο The epithet π. is otherwise (from Homer on) applied to Zeus as god of divination and it is translated accordingly here by Vian, Way and Combellack, even though it is not a traditional attribute of Helius. Koechly sees in the novel application of the epithet ("non satis intellectum") reference to the H. formula (3x) for Helius ὃς πάντ' ἐφορᾷ(ς) καὶ πάντ' ἐπακούει(ς). Thus Pompella translates "che tutto sa."

The notable euphony of **μυρόμεναι...'Ηριδανοῖο 628** is perhaps consciously reminiscent of Σ576 πὰρ ποταμὸν κελάδοντα, παρὰ ῥοδανὸν δονακῆα; cf. A.R. 4.605 /μύρονται...

628 ῥόον 'Ηριδανοῖο/ = A.R. 4.596, Q. 10.192.

629 γέρας ἄφθιτον ~ I413 κλέος ἄ., *H.h.* 2.261 ἄ....τιμήν.

630 /ἤλεκτρον echoing 625 is an element of ring composition, rounding off the aetiological digression.

630 μέγα κτέαρ = 4.543; κτέαρ is a late form (see LSJ s.v.).

631-3 The highlighting of amber in the list is continued with an elaborate resumptive statement.

631 εὐρυπέδοιο πυρῆς ~ Θ164 πυρὴν ἑκατόμπεδον.

631 πυρῆς καθύπερθε βάλοντο/ = 3.684,

632-3 κλυτὸν ἄνδρα.../Αἴαντ' κλ. ἄ. is not H. and unique in Q.; its use with the emphatically placed name in apposition is a perhaps conscious variation on φαίδιμος ἀνήρ 624. Both terms are used at the conclusion of statements of offerings.

The contrast of Ajax's present condition is underlined with **δεδουπότα 632**, for which see 219n.

633 μεγά<λα> στενάχοντες is a necessary emendation, exactly as at 3.3; cf. 5.196.

634 is a notable example of the ABBA pattern.

634 ἐλέφαντα καὶ ἄργυρον ~ τ56.

634 ἄργυρον ἠερόεντα ἠ. properly = 'misty'; it was previously considered corrupt and emended to ἱμερόεντα, but there are parallels for its application to the colour of metals and stones (see LSJ s.v.).

635 ἀμφιφορῆας ἀλείφατος = 3.689, ~ Ψ170.

636 ὄλβον ὀφέλλει/ ~ 7.678 πλοῦτον ὀ./.

637-652 Burning of the Funeral Pyre

637-40 The Greeks light the pyre, and a wind is sent by Thetis to ensure the burning of Ajax. He burns as the wind blows for a night and a day. 641-3 As Enceladus was destroyed by Zeus' thunderbolt and caused the island of Thrinacia to smoke. 644-6 As Heracles was voluntarily burnt alive when overcome by the trickery of Nessus. 646-9 Mount Oeta echoed his cries, and his spirit mingled with the air and joined the gods, while the earth received his body. 650-2 Such is Ajax as he lies in the fire. Of the crowded people the Trojans rejoice and the Greeks grieve.

The corresponding account of the burning of Achilles' pyre, 3.696-718, is largely filled with the action of the winds Boreas and Zephyr after the intervention of Zeus, Hermes and Aeolus, which is closely modelled on Ψ 192-218 with Achilles, Iris, Boreas and Zephyr. The present description begins with just bare mention of the wind sent by Thetis, whose initiative reverses her passive role at 3.698 as recipient of Zeus' favour. Kakridis (65) regards this as the only noteworthy touch of originality in this episode, and it is indeed a fitting sequel to Thetis' role in the preceding games and contest. Most of the episode, however, is occupied with two remarkable

comparisons, with the burning of the giant Enceladus, three lines 641-3, and of Heracles, six lines 644-9. Vian notes that this link between the deaths of Enceladus and Heracles is otherwise found in [Seneca], *Her. Oetaeus* 1733-5. Enceladus here recalls the comparison of Ajax at the moment of his death with the killing of Typhon by Zeus 485, and his juxtaposition with Heracles forms an impressive climax to the comparisons of Ajax with figures of self-destructive strength. The first comparison is a brief one with Orion 404 and the last is an elaborate one with Heracles, which also introduces the different, positive theme of apotheosis. The section concludes, 651-2, with a brief pendant recording the reaction of the onlookers, like that of the Myrmidons 3.711-2.

637 κρατεροῖο πυρὸς μένος ~ Ψ177; see 106n. and 387n.

For **θεὰ Θέτις 638** see 3n.

639 Αἴαντος μεγάλοιο βίη ~ 4.258 βίην Α.; βίη plus gen. of name occurs 14x in H. and 18x in Q.; see 4n. and 22n. Here periphrasis with βίη appropriately balances that with μένος in 637.

639 νύκτα καὶ ἠῶ ~ 3.713; the comparison indicates that ἠῶ is better taken as = 'day', as often in epic.

640 ἐπειγομένου ἀνέμοιο/ = 1.210, ~ Ε501 (-ων -ων).

641-3 Much of the Enceladus simile is a statement of his former destruction, but the point of comparison is the resultant burning stated at the end. The description has some similarity of detail to that of Philostratus the Younger, *Imag.* 2.17.5: πῦρ γὰρ δὴ ὑποτύφει (a prose word used only here by Q.) αὐτὴν (sc. τὴν νῆσον) πᾶσαν...(νῆσος) τὰ τὴν ὕλην ἐξερεθίζοντα παρὰ τῆς θαλάττης ἀνασπῶσα. However, Philostratus links Sicily with Typhon and Italy with Enceladus. For other possible connections between Q. and Philostratus see Vian II 101 and 6-16n., 88n. There is also some similarity between the present description and that of Virgil, *Aen.* 3.578-82: cf. esp. 578 "Enceladi semustum fulmine corpus", 582 "caelum subtexere fumo". At 14.582-5 Q. compares the death of Locrian Ajax with that of Enceladus, where there is a much closer parallel between narrative and simile than in the present passage; the divine agent is Athena and it is said of Sicily ἔτι καίεται αἰέν. See Vian III 172 n.3 for full references to the myth in Greek and Latin poetry.

641-2 Οἷος...δέδμητο is similar to the statement about Typhon 485. For **τὸ πάροιθε 641** see 148n.

641 στονόεντι κεραυνῷ/ occurs 4x in Q.; cf. the H. formula (4x) ἀργῆτι κ./.

642 ἀκαμάτοιο θαλάσσης/ = 1.13, 14.63.

643 Θρινακίης In the *Odyssey* the name denotes the Island of the Sun, but later, like Τρινακρία, it was used for Sicily.

Rhodomann's generally adopted emendation **ἢ 644** for MSS.' ἠδ', linking the two comparisons, is not necessary.

644-7 The longer Heracles simile provides an obviously closer parallel with the narrative, except that the statement of self-immolation begins and ends with emphasis on his being alive—ζώοντα 644 and ζωοῦ 647. The variant **δῶκε θέρεσθαι 644** is obviously preferable to the trivialising δ. φέρ-; cf. 638 and see Vian, *Rech.* 163.
645 Νέσσοιο...χαλεφθείς is a compendious reference to the story of Heracles, Nessus and Deianira, which is included 6.283-5 among the labours of Heracles depicted on the shield of Eurypylus.
646 ἔτλη μέγα ἔργον refers to the self-immolation of Heracles with the help of Poeas, father of Philoctetes, or Philoctetes himself; μ. ἔ. is often euphemistic in H. and Q.
646 ὅλη...Οἴτη ~ 498 μέγα...Ἴδη.
647-9 The statement of the apotheosis of Heracles' spirit (θυμός), contrasted with the burial of his body, reflects, with important differences, λ 601-4, esp. 602 εἴδωλον· αὐτὸς δὲ μετ' ἀθανάτοισι θεοῖσι. Closer to H. is the statement 3.771-2 that Achilles will not be with the dead, but with the gods like Dionysus and Heracles. Vian (I xvii-xviii) observes that Q. displays a mixture of H. and Stoic beliefs concerning the fate of human spirits after death. Unlike the spirit of Patroclus Ψ 100-1, which departs κατὰ χθονός, those in Q. mingle with the air, as here, 7.42 ψυχὴ οἱ πεπότηται ἐς ἠέρα, 11.465-6 στονόεις δέ οἱ ἠέρι θυμὸς / αἷψα μίγη. For the sake of consistency between these passages Koechly emends **αἰθέρι 647** to ἠέρι, but Vian (*loc. cit.*) suggests that the upper air is specified here in view of the apotheosis; see 6-16n. for the distinction. There is, however, a danger of reading too much into the precise wording here, which may unconsciously reflect other literary or non-literary formulations; see e.g. A.M. Dale on Euripides, *Helen* 1013-6 (ed. 1967).
For **ἀρίδηλον 648** see 131n.
648 ἐνεκρίνθη is a non-H., mostly prose, word used only here by Q.
649 ἐπεί...γαῖα ~ 7.42-43, said of the dead Machaon.
649 πολύκμητος with γαῖα in its primary sense 'elaborately wrought' is decidedly otiose, and Vian's defence of it (*Rech.* 195) as = "where (Heracles) had toiled" is not convincing. Therefore the emendation -ον, with σῶμα = 'toiling hard', appropriate for Heracles and the word's prevailing sense in Q., should be adopted, as it is by Pompella.
650 κεῖτο λελασμένος ἰωχμοῖο/ ~ 3.380, 11.315 κεῖντο...λ-οι ἰ./. These are variations on the H. κεῖτο (-σο) μέγας μεγαλωστί, λ. ἱπποσυνάων Π 776 = ω 40; here, together with the following enjambment, it is a fitting solemn closure to the funeral.
651 /Αἴας σὺν τεύχεσσι Disputed armour has caused the death of Ajax, and so there is a sad irony in this final, dignified image of him.
651-2 Πολὺς...'Αχαιοί The three paratactic statements are impressive in their laconic concision.

651-2 ἐστείνετο λαὸς/αἰγιαλοῖς ~ Σ34 /αἰγιαλὸς...στείνοντο δὲ λαοί/.

652 Τρῶες...'Αχαιοί The statement of the contrasted emotions of Trojans and Greeks, with effective chiasmus, is similar to that of the contrasted reactions of Odysseus and the rest of the Greeks to the Trojans' judgement at 321. A practical reason for the Greeks' present feelings is stated at 662-3.

653-663 Burial and Conclusion

653-6 When the body of Ajax is burnt up, the Greeks put away his bones and construct a burial mound near Cape Rhoeteum. 657-8 They return to their ships grieving for one whom they honoured no less than Achilles. 659-63 With the arrival of night they take supper, but then sleep little because of their fear of a Trojan attack now that Ajax is dead.

653-6 The brief account of the burial follows in essentials—quenching of the pyre with wine, placing of the bones in a casket or urn and construction of a burial mound—the much more elaborate one of Achilles 3.719-42, which in turn follows the H. models Ψ 236-57, Ω 791-9, ω 71-81.

653 δέμας ἠΰ, not a H. expression, occurs 5x in Q. in the same *sedes*, always of a dead body.

653 κατήνυσε πῦρ ἀίδηλον ~ 3.720 /ἤνυσε π. ἀ., ω71 φλὸξ ἤνυσεν.

654 = 3.723; **πυρκαϊὴν οἴνῳ σβέσαν** ~ Ψ237, 250.

655 χηλῷ...θῆκαν ~ 3.731-2, 738-9.

655-6 περὶ...ἀκτῆς ~ Ψ256, ω 80-82, 3.739-41.

656 For the traditional location of Ajax's tomb at Cape Rhoeteum, at the E. extremity of the Scamander plain, see Kakridis (65) and Vian.

657 ἐσκίδναντο...ἐπὶ νῆας ~ T277, Ψ3, 6.94.

657 πολυσκάρθμους ἐπὶ νῆας/ ~ 14.10 ἐυσκάρθμους ἐ. ν./; the bold application of both adjs., literally = '(much) leaping', seems intended as a colourful substitute for H. θοάς, 'swift' (see 614n.), and may be original.

658 /θυμὸν ἀκηχέμενοι = Σ29 (-αι), 1.676 (-ῳ), 4.46.

658 τὸν...'Αχιλλεῖ ~ N176 (= O551) ὁ δέ μιν τίεν ἶσα τέκεσσι, 6.133, 7.206, 648. The present statement seems designed to recall the slightly different one about the grief of the Greeks for Ajax λ 556-8; for its importance see 487-663n.

659 Νὺξ...ἄγουσα ~ Ψ232 ἐπὶ...ὕπνος ὄρουσεν, ψ343 ὕπνος...ἐπόρουσε, 6.166, 645 νύξ ἐ....

660 δαῖτ' ἐπάσαντο occurs 4x elsewhere in Q. in the same *sedes*, which supports Koechly's emendation here of MSS.' δαῖτα π.; see 602n. and cf. the H. formula (5x) σπλάγχνα π.

660-1 ἠριγένειαν...ἀποβρίξαντες ~ ι151 (=μ7) ἔνθα δ' ἀποβρίξαντες ἐμείναμεν ἠῶ δῖαν; ἠῶ μίμνον/ *et sim.* occurs 12x in H.

661 ἀραιοῖσι<ν> βλεφάροισιν, literally "with slender eyelids", is a striking and possibly original descriptive touch. It is plausibly interpreted by Vian's "la paupière mi-close" (thus also Pompella). Way's somewhat free rendering, "(sleep) broken by fitful staring through the dark", seems to be based on ἀραιός as a medical term = 'intermittent', applied to breathing, coughing and the like (LSJ s.v. III), which is hardly applicable to eyelids.
662-3 The closing explanation of the Greeks' poor sleep, viz. their fear of a Trojan night attack, is noted by Duckworth ("Foreshadowing and Suspense" 71 n.51) as "striving for suspense". But it is natural enough, and the linking of it to Ajax's death is similar to the fear expressed by Teucer 511-2. It is used to express change of mood after the Greeks' deep sleep at 348ff.
662 αἰνῶς...Τρῶες ~ 8.499-500 (near the end of the book) φοβέοντο γὰρ αἰνῶς / Τρώων μή ποτε λαὸς...; cf. the H. formula (4x) αἰνῶς δείδοικα κατὰ φρένα.
663 Τελαμωνιάδαο θανόντος is a fitting closure for a book of which Ajax is the tragic hero, the cause and the aftermath of his death being its chief themes; for T. see 363n.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

This is not exhaustive, but includes all publications specially relevant to Quintus of Smyrna that have been used for the commentary, most of them referred to explicitly.

Editions and Translations

Combellack, F.M., *The War at Troy: What Homer Didn't Tell, by Quintus of Smyrna*, Norman 1968.

Koechly, A. (H.), *Quinti Smyrnaei Posthomericorum libri XIV...prolegomenis et adnotatione critica*, Leipzig 1850 (reprinted Amsterdam 1968).

Lehrs, F.S., *Quinti Posthomerica...graece et latine*, Paris 1840.

Pompella, G., *Quinto Smirneo, Le Posthomeriche,libri III-VII*, Cassino 1987.

Rhodomann, L., *Quinti Calabri Paraleipomena...XIV libris...latine reddita*, Hanover 1604.

Vian, F., *Quintus de Smyrne, La suite d'Homère,livres V-IX*, Paris 1966.

Way, A.S., *Quintus Smyrnaeus, The Fall of Troy, with an English translation*, London and New York 1913 (reprinted).

Zimmermann, A., *Quinti Smyrnaei Posthomericorum libri XIV*, Leipzig 1891 (reprinted Stuttgart 1969).

Studies

Agosti, G., "Doroteo e Quinto di Smyrne", in Fantuzzi, M., Pretagostini, R., *Struttura e storia dell' esamento greco*, vol. 1, Rome 1995.

Appel, W., "Die homerischen hapax legomena bei Quintus Smyrnaeus: Adverbien", *Glotta* 71 (1993) 178-88.

—, "Grundsätzliche Bemerkungen zu den *Posthomerica* und Quintus Smyrnaeus", *Prometheus* 20 (1994) 1-13.

Bassett, S.E., "The Hill of Success", *CJ* 20 (1925) 414-8.

Byre, C.S., "Per aspera (et arborem) ad astra: Ramifications of the Allegory of Arete in Quintus Smyrnaeus, *Posthomerica* 5.49-68", *Hermes* 110 (1982) 184-95.

Campbell, M., *A Commentary on Quintus Smyrnaeus, Posthomerica XII (Mnemosyne Suppl.* 71), Leiden 1981.

Castiglioni, L., "Intorno a Quinto Smirneo", *Byz.-neugriech. Jahrb.* 2 (1921) 33-52.

Duckworth, G.E., "Foreshadowing and Suspense in the *Posthomerica* of Quintus of Smyrna", *AJP* 57 (1936) 58-86.

—, "Five Centuries of Latin Hexameter Poetry: Silver Age and Late Empire" (appendix on repetition in Quintus), *TAPhA* 98 (1967) 77-150.

Elderkin, G.W., *Aspects of the Speech in the Later Greek Epic*, Baltimore 1906.

Fantuzzi, M., "La visione de Doroteo", *A&R* 30 (1985) 186-97.

García Romero, F.A., "El destino en los *Posthomeria* de Quinto de Esmirna", *Habis* 16 (1985) 101-6.

—, "La intervenciόn psiquica en los *Posthomerica* de Quinto de Esmirna", *Habis* 17 (1986) 109-16.

Glover, T.R., *Life and Letters in the Fourth Century*, Cambridge 1901.

Hermann, G., *Orphica...De aetate scriptoris Argonauticorum*, Leipzig 1805 (reprinted Hildesheim 1971).

Hopkinson, N., *Greek Poetry of the Imperial Period, an Anthology*, Cambridge 1994.

—, "Quintus Smyrnaeus", *OCD*³, 1996.

Hurst, A., Reverdin, O., Rudhart, J., *Vision de Dorothéos, Papyrus Bodmer 29*, Cologny-Geneva 1984.

James, A.W., "Night and Day in Epic Narrative from Homer to Quintus of Smyrna", *Mus. Phil. Lond.* 3 (1978) 153-83.

Kakridis, P.I., *Κόιντος Σμυρναῖος: Γενικὴ μελέτη τῶν Μεθ' Ὅμηρον καὶ τοῦ ποιητή τους*, Athens 1962.

Kessels, A.H.M., Van der Horst, P.W., "The Vision of Dorotheus", *Vigiliae Christ.* 41 (1987) 313-59.

Keydell, R., "Quintus von Smyrna und Vergil", *Hermes* 82 (1954) 254-6 (*Kleine Schriften* [1982] 373-5).

—, "Quintus von Smyrna", *RE* 47 (1963) 1271-96.

Livrea, E., review of *Vision de Dorothéus* (Hurst), *Gnomon* 58 (1986) 687-711.

Lloyd-Jones, H., review of Vian II, *CR* 17 (1967) 275-6.

—, review of *The War at Troy* (Combellack), *CR* 19 (1969) 101.

Mansur, M.W., *The Treatment of Homeric Characters by Quintus of Smyrna*, New York 1940.

Mondino, M., *Su alcune fonti di Quinto Smirneo*, Turin 1958.

Newbold, R. F., "Space and Scenery in Quintus of Smyrna, Claudian and Nonnus", *Ramus* 10 (1981) 53-68.

—, "Nonverbal Expressiveness in Late Greek Epic: Quintus of Smyrna and Nonnus", in Poyatos, F. (ed.), *Advances in Nonverbal Communication*, Amsterdam 1992.

Niemeyer, K.A.E., *Ueber die Gleichnisse bei Quintus Smyrnaeus*, Zwickau 1883-4.

Paley, F.A., *On Quintus Smyrnaeus and the "Homer" of the Tragic Poets*, London 1876.

Paschal, G.W., *A Study of Quintus of Smyrna*, Chicago 1904.

Pompella, G., *Index in Quintum Smyrnaeum*, Hildesheim 1981.

Roberts, T., *A Study of the Similes of Late Greek Epic*, Univ. of Sydney M.A. thesis 1986 (unpublished).

Sainte-Beuve, C.A., *Etude sur Virgile...étude sur Quintus de Smyrne*, Paris 1857.

Schenk, P., "Handlungsstruktur und Komposition in den *Posthomerica* des Quintus Smyrnaeus", *RM* 140 (1997) 363-85.

Schmidt, E.G., "Quintus von Smyrna—der schlechteste Dichter des Altertums?", *Phasis* I (1999) 139-50.

Svensson, A., *Der Gebrauch des bestimmten Artikels in der nachklass. griech. Epik.*, Lund 1937.

Vian, F., "Les comparaisons de Quintus de Smyrne", *RPh* 28 (1954) 30-51, 235-43.

—, *Histoire de la tradition manuscrite de Quintus de Smyrne*, Paris 1959.

—, *Recherches sur les Posthomerica de Quintus de Smyrne*, Paris 1959.

—, Battegay, E., *Lexique de Quintus de Smyrne*, Paris 1984.

—, "A propos de la *Vision de Dorothéos*", *ZPE* 60 (1985) 45-49.

Visser, E., *Homerische Versifikationstechnik: Versuch einer Rekonstruktion*, Frankfurt am Main 1987.

West, M.L., "Echoes and Imitations of the Hesiodic Poems", *Philologus* 113 (1969) 1-9.

—, "Last Notes on Quintus of Smyrna", *Philologus* 130 (1986) 145-9.

Wifstrand, A., *Von Kallimachos zu Nonnos: Metrisch-stilistische Untersuchungen*, Lund 1933.

INDEX OF SUBJECTS

Numbers refer to line numbers at the head of notes in the commentary, except those in brackets, which refer to pages in the introduction.

Achilles 139-64, 149, 235-6, 487-663
adjectives (21), (26), 11, 17-19, 18, 20-21, 34, 38-39, 65, 73-75, 160, 185, 240, 372, 399, 453, 649
Aeneas (5)
Agamemnon (15), 135, 166-7, 487-663, 559-67
Ajax (son of Telamon) (14), 128-38, 180-317, 318-32, 352-94, 420-1, 423-4, 428-31, 433-8, 487-663
allegory (12), 43-44, 49-56
alliteration (24), 39, 63, 314, 363, 428, 441, 448, 628
ambiguity 9-10, 125, 162, 176, 229, 244, 590, 625
amphibrach 152
anacoluthon (23), 375-8
Apelles (12), 70
Aphrodite Anadyomene 70
Apollonius Rhodius 322-9, 322-3, 625-30
apposition 38-39, 207-9, 632-3
assonance (24), 39, 63, 114, 314, 363, 428, 441, 445, 628
asyndeton 256,358
Attic correption (31), 22, 247, 374, 521
Attic forms (22), 2, 374, 417, 530
augment (22), 48, 240, 547, 602, 660
awkwardness of expresion (23), 27-28, 51, 256, 313-4, 358, 492
bathos 614
Bessarion (3)
Bodmer papyrus (7)
brevity (20), 125, 128-38, 165-79, 177, 363-4, 401, 482-4, 645, 651-2, 653-6
characterisation (13)
chiasmus (24), 81-82, 100-1, 143, 251-2, 430-1, 478-81, 561, 563-4, 634, 652
Christianity (12)
climax (18), 36-37, 80-96, 135, 352-94, 386-9, 386, 637-52
commonplaces (12-13), 49-56, 155-6, 242-52, 553-6, 574-5, 595-7, 598-617
compound words 21, 114, 118, 121, 188, 190, 246, 289, 314, 316, 342, 372
conditional expression 206-10, 218-22, 359-60
Constantinople (5)
Corycus 49-56
Cymothoe 333-51
definite article (22), 148, 170, 542
deities (11), 121-79, 318-9, 352-94, 359-60, 361-2
Delphi 49-56
dialogue (17), 404-50
digamma (31), 44, 126, 216, 255, 399
digression (18-19), 333-51, 348, 349-51, 395-403, 451-5, 618-36, 630
dramatic tension (17), 165-79, 319-20, 352-94, 404-50, 662-3
dual 128
ecphrasis (20), 1-120
editions (1)
elision 216, 263, 602
ellipsis (23), 27-28, 134, 153-4, 157, 176, 177, 186, 191, 235-6, 259, 287-9, 310, 369, 457, 476
English translations (2)
enjambment (31), 17-19, 31-33, 62, 78, 93, 129-30, 169-70, 222-3, 245, 257-8, 259-60, 265, 274, 289, 349-51, 417-8, 472, 478, 500-1, 554, 632-3, 650
Epic Cycle (1), (6-7), (10)
epic dignity (15), 128-38, 352-94, 404-50, 439-50, 482, 487-663, 651
epic words (21-22), 219, 262, 414
epithets:
- context-specific uses 135, 157, 189, 243, 292, 308, 338, 358, 361, 405
- new applications 79, 143, 158, 165, 174, 189, 243, 249, 292, 395, 625, 626, 657

new meanings 157, 626
new words 135, 188, 316, 338
subjects 143, 165, 188, 196, 213-4, 338, 614
Erasistratus 322-9
euphemism 646
figura etymologica 62
final clauses 171-2, 206-10, 280-1, 384, 517
foreshadowing (18), 7, 45-48, 80, 128-38, 165-79, 224-8, 256-62, 311-2, 318-32, 331-2, 451-5, 474-5, 521-31, 568-9, 583-8
formulae (24-30), 30, 34, 58a, 75, 95, 103, 118, 122, 129, 136, 139, 143, 165, 174, 175, 177, 183, 184, 185, 186, 191, 202, 204, 219, 224, 227, 230, 272, 291, 301, 307, 322, 330, 331, 332, 343, 346, 355, 357, 359, 367, 373, 387, 396, 403, 406, 412, 414, 416, 428, 438, 450, 464, 482, 484, 488, 508, 515, 521, 532, 534, 535, 541, 543, 559, 569, 572, 573, 575, 579, 582, 594, 595, 596, 597, 602, 605, 606, 611, 613, 616, 618, 621, 623, 628, 631, 633, 635, 640, 641, 642, 653, 658, 660
future aorist 168, 516, 589-90
future present 146
future with κε(ν) 126-7
glaucoma 322-9
gloss (22), 299
Gorgons 38-40
hapax legomena 21, 59, 97, 101, 105, 114, 188, 190, 289
hendiadys 319, 591
Herophilus 322-9
Hesiod 49-56, 238
hiatus (30), 16, 27, 44, 152, 163, 169, 194, 281, 289, 399, 607
Hippocratic theory of humours 322-9
horses 25-27
humour 402-3
Idomeneus 121-79, 350
inconsistency (21), 55-56, 278-81
indirect speech 281, 356-8
informal peech (23), 310, 476
irony (17), 404-50, 574-97, 651
laments (17), 487-663, 532-58, 568-97, 574-97
Lascaris, Constantine (2-3)
legal practice (16), 180-317
legal speeches (16), 180-236
legal terminology 157
lengthening, metrical (31), 43, 113, 114, 524
manuscripts (3)
meanings of words 53, 58a, 157, 222, 288, 525, 587, 626
medical interests (13), 322-9
metaphor (24), 169-70, 190, 322, 324, 365, 369, 379, 380-4, 386, 423-4, 444, 510, 536, 552, 556, 579
middle voice (22), 318, 466, 485, 510, 551, 565, 579, 619
mocking speeches (17), 439-50
Myra 49-56
negative appraisal (20-21)
Nestor (15), 135, 139-64, 150-1, 574-97, 598-617
novel expressions 47, 169-70, 197, 473, 500-1, 546, 552, 570, 591, 661
Odysseus (14-15), 143, 180-318, 257, 285-6, 291-317, 358, 574-97
originality (23), (29), 47, 49-56, 53, 58a, 94, 108, 119, 118, 121-79, 121, 135, 143, 147, 157, 169-70, 170, 180-236, 188, 190, 197, 206, 222, 243-50, 243-5, 246, 264, 276, 287-9, 287-8, 289, 314, 316, 322-9, 342, 346, 372, 381, 395-403, 395, 404-50, 433-8, 445, 451-5, 473, 493-6, 500-1, 509, 524-5, 546, 552, 570, 587, 591, 618-36, 626, 637-52, 657, 661
Ovid 180-236, 194-6, 229-34, 237-90, 290
palm 49-56
paradox (17), 395-403
parataxis (23), 7, 235-6, 651-2
Parthenon 49-56
pathos 141-2
Peleus and Thetis (12), 73-79, 333-51
periphrasis (23), 4, 22, 58a, 136, 177, 276, 306, 378, 639
personification (11), 25-42, 71, 359-60, 395-403, 405, 451-5, 452, 484, 625-30
Phidias 102-20
Philadelphia (Lydia) 49-56
pleonasm (23), 171, 583
polar expression 167
Polycarp (5)
Prometheus 333-51
prose usage (22), 91, 157, 171-2, 206, 277, 281, 293, 510, 515
Pythagoras 49-56
relative clauses 298
repetition (23), 38-39, 144, 165, 180, 249, 251-2, 266, 293, 297, 317, 325, 348, 354, 427, 441, 447, 454, 469, 477, 497, 502, 518, 520, 529, 531, 537-9, 547, 549, 560-1, 562-3, 568, 589, 598, 601, 603, 654

rhetoric (16-18), (23-24), 121-79, 139-64, 180-317, 180-236, 193, 197-9, 202, 209-10, 214, 287-9, 311, 439-50
rhetorical questions 181-2, 191-4, 211-4, 229-34, 465-7, 476, 509-20
Rhodomann, Lorenz (4)
rhyme (24), 21, 76, 81-82, 103-4, 321, 325-7
ring composition (19), 97-98, 209-10, 378, 424-6, 439-50, 448, 565-7, 611, 630
Rome (5)
separation, emphatic 39, 207-9, 251-2, 276-7, 325-7, 570
similes (19-20), 17-24, 22-24, 57, 60-65, 80-96, 130, 132, 131-2, 133, 188, 247-8, 297, 352-94, 364-9, 366, 369, 371-8, 371, 380-4, 386-9, 386, 388, 391-2, 404-12, 406-7, 409-10, 435-7, 461-2, 462, 484, 487-99, 493-6, 503, 503-6, 637-52, 641-3, 644-7
Smyrna (4), 49-56
soliloquies (17), 451-86, 464, 465-81
Sophocles 451-86, 470-5, 487-663, 521-31, 532-58
speeches (16-17)
spondaic diaeresis in 4th foot 370, 419
Stoicism (12-13), 574-97, 647-9
subjunctive (22), 280-1, 356-8, 380, 409
subtlety 239
synizesis 233
syntax 94, 119, 147, 157, 170, 206, 264, 276, 445
tautology (23), 21, 155-6, 204-5, 518-9
Titanomachy (12), 102-20
title (1)
tmesis 208
transferred epithets (23), 28, 50, 161, 385, 496
tree 49-56
trochaic caesura in 4th foot (31), 152, 209, 272
typical scenes (20), 348-54
variation (24), 5, 8, 12, 243-50, 348
vernacular (22)
Virgil 13, 641-3
visual art (12), 49-56, 70, 73-79, 102-20, 121-79
visualisation (12), 6-16, 65,104
weakness, poetic (21), 97-98, 180-317, 487-9
word forms 108, 135, 381, 509
word order (24)
word play (24), 31-33, 69-70, 227, 491
zeugma (23), 154, 179

INDEX OF ANCIENT AND MEDIAEVAL LITERATURE

All references are included except those to the *Posthomerica*, the *Iliad* and the *Odyssey*, which are too numerous to be noteworthy.

Aeschylus, *Armorum iud.* :180-317
—, *Septem* 387-649: 1-120, 45-48
[Aeschylus], *Prometheus* 442-71, 476-506: 243-50
Aethiopis: 121-79
Alcaeus of Messene (*Anthol. Gr.* 9.519): 206
Anthologia Graeca: 188
7.351.4: 49-50
9.519.3-4: 206
9.790.4: 49-50
Antipater of Sidon (*Anthol. Gr.* 9.790): 49-50, 188
Antisthenes, *Ajax* and *Odysseus*: 121-79, 180-317
—, *Aj.* 6: 278-81
—, *Od.* 3 and 8: 278-81
Apollodorus, *Bibliotheca*: (7)
—, *Epitome* 5.6: 433-8
Apollonius Rhodius: (7), 128, 133, 147, 219, 222, 237, 262, 300, 322-3, 324, 360, 383, 386-9, 587
Argonautica 1.264: 530
1.350: 140
1.450-2: 346
1.561: 97
1.721-68: 8
1.730-67: 1-120, 13
1.785: 168
1.1059: 619
1.1339-42: 589-93
2.17: 168
2.376: 190
2.510: 554
2.661: 28
2.1077: 205
2.1196: 612
2.1247-59: 333-51
3.99: 147
3.107: 237
3.168: 432
3.188-90: 262-7
3.231: 109
3.303: 612
3.307-8: 152
3.656-63: 503-6
3.676: 30
3.744-824: 395-403
3.761-5: (10), 322-9
3.837: 146
3.1214: 99
3.1300: 114
4.216-7: 409-10
4.261: 10
4.328: 244
4.491: 190
4.596: 628
4.598: 625-30
4.603-11: (10), 625-30
4.605-6: 625, 628
4.1142: 623
4.1279: 322
4.1535: 619
4.1681: 51
4.1710: 389
Aratus, *Phaenomena* 100-14: 45-48
254-67: 367
Aristarchus: 19, 333
Aristotle, *Poetica* 1452b 34-36: 128-38
Arrian, *Cynegeticus* 1.1: 17-24
Callimachus: 239
—, *Epigram* 17.1: 206
—, *frag.* 301: 64
—, *frag.* 498:10
Catullus, 64.50-266: 1-120
Cebes, *Tabula*: 49-56
Cercidas, *frag.* 8.2: 64
Cypria, frag. 7.9: 576
Dionysius, *Bassarica, frag.* 19 verso 21: 180

Dionysius Periegetes, 604: 43
Dioscorides (*Anthol. Gr.* 7.351): 49-50
Dorotheus, *Visio*: (7-9)
209: (8), 92
300: (7-8)
340-1:(8)
Empedocles, *Physica* 16 (26).4: 248
Euripides: 180-317, 330
—, *Alcestis* 585-6: 119
—, *Bacchae* 1277-86: 457
—, *Electra* 442-78: 1-120, 38-40
—, *Hecuba*: (7), (14)
—, *Helena* 1013-6: 647
—, *Hercules* 822ff.: 359-60
931-5: 322-9, 440
1089-97: 457
—, *Hippolytus* 1365: 130
—, *Ion* 505-6: 209
1152:367
—, *Iphigenia Taur.* 288: 31-33
—, *Phaethon* 77-78: 1-120
—, *Phoenissae* 1107-38: 1-120
—, *Supplices*: (7)
—, *Troades* (14)
376-82: 444-8
686-93: 80-87
989-90: 69
Eusebius, *Historia Eccles.* 7.32.2-4, 8.1.4, 8.6.1-5: (9)
Eustathius, *passim*: (3)
—, *ad* P749: 15
—, *ad* α234: 169-70
—, *ad* λ546: 121-79
Heraclitus, *Allegoriae* 49.2-4: 43-44
Herodian, Grammaticus: 168
Hesiod: 31-33, 71, 72, 206, 338
—, *Catalogus* 33(a).26: 223
198.3: (10), 238
—, *Opera* 9: 179
39:157
225-37: 45-48
267-9: 46
287-92: (10), 49-56
460: 62
619-20: 367-8
—, *Scutum*: (10)
122-38: 102-20
139-317: 1-120
144: 6-16
148: 31-33
149-50: 40-42
154: 5
156-9: 25-42, 29-30, 31-33, 34
161: 5
162-3: 40-42
189: 13
194:13
209-12: 96
210: 34
229-37: 38-40
244: 68
257: 34
267-8: 36-37
281: 67
286-301: 57-65
286: 34
288: 58a
310-1: 1
314-5: 99-101
386-91: 20-21
—, *Theogonia* 1-34: (4)
2:50
64: 71
140: 249
201: 71
217: 31-33
245: 333-51
300: 50
337ff.: 14
483: 50
664-720: 102-20
694: 386-9
696-7: 106
820-68: 102-20
Hesychius: 119, 265, 524-5
Homeric Hymn, Aphrodite 217: 89
258: 50
—, *Apollo* 194: 72
223:50
341:517
417:95
—, *Demeter* 14: 95
124: 332
261: 629
300: 594
—, *Hermes* 147: 396
464: 143
10.4: 548
28.15: 587
Ilias Parva, frag. 2a: 121-79
Ilioupersis, frag. 1.7-8: 322-9
Lycophron, *Alexandra*: (7)

Moschus, 2.43: 4
2.44-62: 1-120
2.44: 8
2.47: 13
2.50: 8
2.55: 8
2.115-7: 88-96, 93
Nonnus: (5), 29-30
—, *Dionysiaca*: 180-236, 359-60
5.144-89: 1-120
20.94-98: 49-56
25.387-562: 1-120
36.325: 16
41.294-302: 1-120
42.283: 146
Oppian: (6), 30
—, *Cynegetica* 1.166: 403
3.176: 74
4.213: 18
4.232: 50
4.349: 65
—, *Halieutica* 1.112: 5
1.709-18: 371-8
2.132: 224
2.204: 610
2.625: 18
5.567: 105
Orphic Lithica 147-8: 435-7
Ovid, *Metamorphoses*: (7)
12.626 ff.: 121-79
13.1-381: (11), 180-317
13.5-122: 180-236
13.5-6: 181-2
13.7-8: 214-7
13.21-33: 235-6
13.34-42: 191-4
13.43-54: 194-6
13.55-60: 197-9
13.73-81: 200-10
13.82-90: 214-7
13.91-94: 214-7
13.107-12: 224-8
13.120: 229-34
13.121-2: 218-23
13.142-3: 290
13.162-70: 256-62
13.239-52: 253-5
13.262-7: 287-9
13.275-9: 282-4
13.280-5: 285-6
13.320-4: 256-62
Pausanias, 8.34.1: 452
10.15.4-5: 49-56
Persius, 3.56-57, 5.34-35: 49-56
Philoponus, John: (6)
Philostratus, *Imagines* 1.8.1: 88
2.17.5: 641-3
10.5 and 7: 6-16
—, *Vitae Sophist.*: (6)
1.25 (543): 49-56
Photius, *Bibliotheca*: (6)
Pindar, *Nem.* 8: 128-38
8.26f.: 121-79
Pisander of Laranda: (6)
Plutarch, *Quaest. conviv.* 8.4 (723-4): 49-56
Proclus, *Chrestomathia*: (6)
Prodicus: 49-56
Sappho, 1.14: 72
22.11-12: 71
96.9: 130
Seneca, *Agamemnon*: (7)
—, *Herc. Oet.* 1733-5: 637-52
Septuagint: 206
Silius Italicus, *Pun.* 2.406-50: 1-120
2.430: 13
Sophocles, *Ajax*: (7), (10), 352-94, 559-67
27: 433-8
45: 359-60
51ff.: 363-4
79: 440
101-17, 237-44, 296-304: 439-50
118-32, 766-77: 128-38
303: 440
305-12: 457
322: 464
387-91: 470-5
401-2: 465-7
452: 466
485-524: 532-58
487-9: 542-3
550ff.: 527, 528
815-65: 451-86
817ff.: 482-4
833-4: 482-4
835-44: (10), 470-5
843: 454
894: 522-3
1008-20: 509-20
1026ff.: 482-4
1135-7: 121-79
1245: 169-70
1248-9: 169-70

1250-4: 243-50
1276ff.: 214-7
1316-75: 574-97
—, *Antigone* 332-52: 243-50
—, *Electra* 835: 51
—, *Philoctetes* (14)
373: 285-6
1025-8: 191-4
—, *Scyriae* 557.2: 598-617
Theocritus, 1.27-56: 1-120
10.44: 59
Theognis, 582: 62
Thucydides: 180-317
Triphiodorus: (5), 29-30
289: 366
Tzetzes, John: (3-4)
Valerius Flaccus, *Arg.* 1.130-9: 73-79
2.605: 333-51
Virgil, *Aeneid*: (7)
1.127: 88
1.142-7: 88-96, 333-51
1.466-93: 1-120
3.578-82: (11), 641-3
5.821: 91-92
8.626-728: 1-120
8.671-4: 87, 93-96
8.691: 13
Xenophanes, 1.13: 157, 593
Xenophon, *Cyro.* 1.6.28: 17-24
—, *Mem.* 2.1.21-34: 49-56

INDEX OF GREEK WORDS

ἀάσπετος 108
ἀάσχετος 144
ἀγάλλομαι 622
Ἀγαμέμνων (27)
ἀγοράομαι 432
ἀγρότης 247, 374
ἀγών 123
ἀδινώτερος 503
ἄεθλον 218
ἀελλόπους 89
ἀέξω 146, 242, 264
ἀήρ 6-16, 11
Αἴας (28)
αἰγλήεις 131, 623
αἰζηός 64, 319
αἰθήρ 6-16
Αἰνείας (27)
αἰνός 181, 453
αἰνῶς 662
αἰπύς 453
αἰπύτατος 49-50
Αἶσα 582, 594
ἄιστος 426
αἰτέω 134
ἀκάματος 28, 526, 642
ἀλγινόεις 20-21
ἀλεγεινός 15, 18, 325
ἄλκαρ 514
ἄλλοθεν 83
ἄλλυδις 9, 16
ἀλωή 47-48
ἄμαλλα 61
ἀμαλλοδετήρ 59
ἄμβροτος 2
ἀμείλιχος 34
ἀμέρδω 384
ἀμετροεπής 239
ἀμητήρ 57
ἀμοιβάδιος 65
ἀμπέχω 106, 353-4
ἀμύμων 399
ἀμφήριστος 310
ἀμφί 8, 251-2, 287-8
ἀμφιβάλλομαι 579
ἀμφιμέμηλε 190
ἀμφιποτάομαι 71
ἀμφίς 93, 382
ἀμφιτεύχω 14, 103
ἀμφίτομος 208
ἄν 359-60
ἀναδύομαι 70
ἀναιδής 18, 371
ἄναλκις 187
ἀναπίμπλημι 426
ἀναπνέω 109
ἀναστοναχέω 464
ἀνέγρομαι 610
ἀνηλεγέως 168
ἀνηλεής 601
ἀντίθεος 158, 305, 612
ἄνυμαι 58a, 410
ἄορ 114
ἀπανύω 1
ἀπαφίσκω 181, 422
ἀπειρέσιος 11, 94
ἀπείρων 333, 566-7
ἀποαίνυμαι 623-4
ἀποβρίζω 660-1
ἀπορούω 346
ἀποφαιδρύνω 616
ἀραιός 661
ἀργαλέος 240-2
Ἀρετή 49-56
ἀρήιος 459
ἀρηρεμένος 116
ἀρίδηλος 131
ἄρρηκτος 243
ἄρτιος 227
ἀσκέω 6
ἄσπετος 65, 355, 389
ἀσχαλάω 103, 595
ἄσχετος 478
ἀτέμβομαι 147
ἄτη 164, 322-9
αὖτις 62, 291
ἄφαρ 15
ἄφθιτος 629
ἀφραδέως 443
Ἀχιλῆι 285
Ἀχιλλεύς (28)

ἄχνυμαι 572
ἄψεα 30

βάζω 272
βαθυσκόπελος 372
βάλλομαι 510, 602
βαρυηχής 245
βίη 639
βλαβεῖν 509
βλάπτομαι 466
βλήμενος 184
βλοσυρός 20-21, 452
βοοσσόος 64
βριαρός 111, 616
βρίθω 365
βρυχή 392

γάρ τε 145
γε μέν 470
Γοργόνες 38-40
γυνή 590

(ἐν) δαΐ 206
δαίς 209
δαρδάπτω 448
δεδουπώς 219, 448
δέμας 653
δέος 489
δεῦρο 515
δήιος 269
διακεδάννυμι 208
διαχέω 536
διειδής 79, 625
διηνεκέως 495
δικάζομαι 318
δικάζω 157
Δίκη 46
δινέομαι 619
δολόεις 358
δολομῆτα 292
δόλος 457
δορύκτητος 160
δύνω 343-4
δύσετο 354
δυσηχής 36

ἑαυτόν 510
ἔγκειμαι 26
ἐγκρίνω 648
ἑδνωτής 524-5
ἐέλδομαι 140, 446

ἔθνεα 248, 403
εἰ καί 308
εἰρόποκος 493
εἰσκαταδύω 301
ἐκεῖσε 293
ἐμπίμπραμαι 485
ἐν 8
ἔνδοθεν 568
ἐνένιπεν 237
ἐνί 341
ἐννεσίῃσι 195, 383
ἐνστηρίζω 101
ἐντυπάς 530
Ἐνυώ 29
ἐξελαύνω 425
ἐξοροθύνω 576
ἔοικα 527, 608
ἐπεὶ ἤ 399
ἐπεὶ ἤ νυ 542
ἐπεί νυ 186
ἐπελθεῖν 302
ἐπεμβαίνω 51
ἐπεσσυμένως (8), 92, 270
ἐπέων 233
ἐπιάλλω 412
ἐπιβαίνω 460, 552
ἐπιβραχεῖν 393
ἐπιδέρκομαι 46
ἐπιέναι 214
ἐπικάρσιος 80-81
ἐπιλανθάνομαι 480
ἐπιμήδομαι 197
ἐπιπείθομαι 137
ἐπίρροθος 254
ἐπισπεῖν 500-1
ἐπιτάρροθος 254
ἐπιτίθεμαι 466
ἐπιχέω 556
ἐπορούω 659
ἐρατεινός 176
ἔργα 136
ἐριδαίνομαι 105
ἐριδμαίνω 128
ἐρίθυμος 316
Ἐριννύες 31-33
ἕρκος 423-4
ἑρπύζω 508
ἐρρέτω 477
εὐθαλής 77
ἐυκτίμενος 548
ἐυκτυπέων 21

εὖ μάλα 554
ἐυμμελίης 165
εὐποίητος 621
ἐύπρῳρος 330
ἐυπτόλεμος 174, 320
εὐρύπεδος 631
εὐρύπορος 74
εὐρύς 591
ἐύς 54
ἐυσθενής 256
ἐύσταχυς 61
ἐυστέφανος 71
εὖτε 380
εὐτρεφής 384
ἐυφροσύνη 263
ἐύφρων 157, 199, 593
ἐφίημι 157

ζάθεος 50
ζεύγλη 60
ζέω 324, 379

ἠερόεις 634
ἠιόεις 299
ἤλεκτρον 625
ἠλίβατος 243
ἦμαρ 378, 505, 535, 543
ἡμᾶς 417
ἦρα φέρω 163, 274
ἠύκομος 72
ἠύς 653
ἠύτε 409
ἠώς 639

θεά, θεή 3, 563
θέμεθλον 326
θεόκμητος 6
θεὸς ὥς 558
θεουδής 587
θεσπέσιος 122
Θέτις 3
θοός 213-4, 300, 614
θρασύφρων 5
θυμηδής 544
θυμήρης 546
θυμός 467

ἱδρώς 36-37
ἱερός 56, 191
ἰθύνω 179
Ἵμερος 71

ἰότης 250
ἵστημι 67

καί 303
κακός 229
κακώτερον 574
καλός 530
καναχηδόν 21
κάρτος 262, 266
κατά 28, 100, 388
καταιγίς 84
καταισχύνω 228
καταπτώσσω 186
κατατίθημι 123-4
κε(ν) 126, 310, 359-60
κέαρ 531
κεῖσε 293
κεκασμένος 78
κῆρ 306, 468
Κῆρες 34-37, 536, 601-2
κλυτός 632-3
κορέννυμι 599
κουριδίη 445
κράτος 262, 266
κτέαρ 630
κυανοκρήδεμνος 121
κῦδος 520
κυκλόθεν 16
κύων 439-50

λατόμος 244
λελασμένος 650
λευγαλέος 30
λήιον 58a
Λῆμνος 196
λιμός 407
λύω 272
λώβη 197

μαίνομαι 369
μακρός 76
Μανίη 452
μαρμαίρω 4
μεγαλήτωρ 2
μεγαλόβρυχος 188
μέγας 236, 646
μέγεθος 264
μεδέω 525
μειλίχιος 261
μέλας 379
μελεϊστί 208, 358

μελιηδής 352-3
μεμελημένος 263
μεμιγμένος 263
μενεαίνω 283
μενεδήιος 189
μένος 22, 276, 387
μετά 310
μετατρέπομαι 410
μετόπισθε 169-70
μηλονόμος 433
μητιόων 135, 338
(ἀνά) μόθον 204
Μοῖρα 331-2

νεόδμητος 161
νηῦς (29)
νίσομαι 82
νῦν δ' ἤδη 200
νῦν μέν 550

ὀβριμόθυμος 249
ὄβριμος 20-21, 118, 438
ὄγμος 57
'Οδυσσεύς (28-29)
οἶδμα 95
οἰκτρόν 569
ὀίομαι 516, 589-90
οἴχομαι 545
ὀλοός 160, 473
ὀλοόφρων 405
ὀλοφύρομαι 464
ὁμόφρων 547
ὁμῶς 11, 222
ὀπάζω 174
ὁπόσος 524
ὄρεσφι 388
ὅς 241, 474, 575-6
ὅς τε 298, 575-6
ὅτε 191
οὐδέ 442
οὐδὲ μέν 225
οὐλόμενος 31-33
ὄφρα 171-2, 206-10, 517

πανομφαῖος 626
πανσυδίῃ 498
παραβλήδην 237
παρακατάκειμαι 102
παρεκτανύω 118
παρηγορέω 612
(τὸ) πάροιθε 148
πατέομαι 660
πάτος 54
παχνόω 322
πείθομαι 152
πελώριος 112, 385, 576
πεπληγώς 91
περιδείδω 217
περικαλλής 44, 228
περικαταβάλλω 469
περικαταπίπτω 322-3, 490, 502
περικτείνομαι 26
περιμαρμαίρω 114
περινίσομαι 287-8
περιπετάννυμαι 570
περιτρομέω 276
περιφραδής 143
περιχάσκω 537
Πηληιάδης 159
Πηλιάς 119
πινυτός 265
Πληιάς 367
πνέω 120
πολύιδρις 155-6
πολύκλυστος 351
πολύκμητος 649
πολυσθενής 603
πολύσκαρθμος 657
πολύστονος 582
πολυτειρής 314
πολύτλητος 45, 361
πολύτροπος 238
πόρδαλις 19, 248
ποτί 414
Πρίαμος (28)
(τὸ) πρίν 542
προφερέστερος 309
πυκινόφρων 98

ῥοιβδηδόν 381

σαίνω 95
σθένος 4, 206, 224
σκόλοψ 53
σμερδαλέος 17-19
σπεῖρος 615
στερεός 597
(ἐνὶ) στέρνοισιν 175
στεφανόω 99
στιβαρός 113
στονόεις 80, 185, 357, 641
συγκλονέω 369

συμμογέω 105
σφίσι 162, 170
σχέτλιε 211

τανύπρωρος 330, 348
τανυχειλής 12
τείρεα 9-10
Τέκμησσα 521
τέκνον 374
Τελαμωνιάδης 363, 663
τέλος 515
τεράατα 43
τέρας 366
τέρπομαι 551
τεύχη 2
τεχνηέντως 97
Τηθύς 14, 398
τηλόθι 540
τί 476
τίη 509
τίθεμαι 565
τίπτε 211
τλάω 597
τραφερή 537
Τριτωνίς 360
τῶ 534

υἷες 177
ὑπαί 434
ὑπεκπεράω 246
ὑπέρ 277
ὑπερβλύζω 324
ὑπερέχω 130
ὑπέρθυμος 73
ὑπερουτάω 289
ὑπέρτατος 462
ὑποείκω 216
ὑποκλάω 458
ὑποτλάω 342
ὑποτμήγω 244
ὑψίκομος 119

φαίδιμος 308, 624
φαίης κε 13
φερέσβιος 517
φέρω 40-42
φθισήνωρ 25, 231
φίλα φρονέων 559
φιλοπτόλεμος 158
φῦλα 621

χανδάνω 111
(ἐνὶ) χάρμῃ 202
χεῦμα 14
χηρόω 496
χρυσήνιος 395

ψαύω 52

ὤ μοι 465
ὣς ἄρ' ἔφη 291
ὡς ὄφελον 194, 206

SUPPLEMENTS TO MNEMOSYNE

EDITED BY H. PINKSTER, H.W. PLEKET
C.J. RUIJGH, D.M. SCHENKEVELD AND P.H. SCHRIJVERS

Recent volumes in the series:

190. Hout, M.P.J. van den. *A Commentary on the Letters of M. Cornelius Fronto.* 1999. ISBN 90 04 10957 9
191. Kraus, C. Shuttleworth (ed.). *The Limits of Historiography.* Genre and Narrative in Ancient Historical Texts. 1999. ISBN 90 04 10670 7
192. Lomas, K. & T. Cornell. *Cities and Urbanisation in Ancient Italy.* ISBN 90 04 10808 4 *In preparation*
193. Malkin, I. *History of Greek Colonization.* ISBN 90 04 09843 7 *In preparation*
194. Wood, S.E. *Imperial Women.* A Study in Public Images, 40 B.C. - A.D. 68. 1999. ISBN 90 04 11281 2
195. Ophuijsen, J.M. van & P. Stork. *Linguistics into Interpretation.* Speeches of War in Herodotus VII 5 & 8-18. 1999. ISBN 90 04 11455 6
196. Tsetskhladze, G.R. (ed.). *Ancient Greeks West and East.* 1999. ISBN 90 04 11190 5
197. Pfeijffer, I.L. *Three Aeginetan Odes of Pindar.* A Commentary on *Nemean* V, *Nemean* III, & *Pythian* VIII. 1999. ISBN 90 04 11381 9
198. Horsfall, N. *Virgil,* Aeneid 7. A Commentary. 2000. ISBN 90 04 10842 4
199. Irby-Massie, G.L. *Militaty Religion in Roman Britain.* 1999. ISBN 90 04 10848 3
200. Grainger, J.D. *The League of the Aitolians.* 1999. ISBN 90 04 10911 0
201. Adrados, F.R. *History of the Graeco-Roman Fable.* I: Introduction and from the Origins to the Hellenistic Age. Translated by L.A. Ray. Revised and Updated by the Author and Gert-Jan van Dijk. 1999. ISBN 90 04 11454 8
202. Grainger, J.D. *Aitolian Prosopographical Studies.* 2000. ISBN 90 04 11350 9
203. Solomon, J. *Ptolemy* Harmonics. Translation and Commentary. 2000. ISBN 90 04 115919
204. Wijsman, H.J.W. *Valerius Flaccus Argonautica, Book VI.* A Commentary. 2000. ISBN 90 04 11718 0
205. Mader, G. *Josephus and the Politics of Historiography.* Apologetic and Impression Management in the *Bellum Judaicum.* 2000. ISBN 90 04 11446 7
206. Nauta, R.R. *Poetry for Patrons.* Literary Communication in the Age of Domitian. 2000. ISBN 90 04 10885 8
207. Adrados, F.R. *History of the Graeco-Roman Fable.* II: The Fable during the Roman Empire and in the Middle Ages. Translated by L.A. Ray. Revised and Updated by the Author and Gert-Jan van Dijk. 2000. ISBN 90 04 11583 8
208. James, A. & K. Lee. *A Commentary on Quintus of Smyrna,* Posthomerica V. 2000. ISBN 90 04 11594 3